STATE LIBRARY OF PENNSYLVANIA
main,stks 133.4L463
Materials toward a history of
v.3
0 0001 00265435 6

OK TO CIRC JAS 2/25/85
OK MR 11/2010

Date Due

MAR 2 5 1985			
DEC 2 0 1988			
MAR 2 1998			

PRINTED IN U.S.A. CAT. NO. 24 161 BRO DART

0 1 6 3 6 3 7 2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

https://archive.org/details/materialstowardh00leah

Vol. II missing
Loaned from stacks
V. III, c. 2 civ/c.

MATERIALS TOWARD A

HISTORY OF WITCHCRAFT

COLLECTED BY

HENRY CHARLES LEA, LL.D.

Volume III

ARRANGED AND EDITED BY

ARTHUR C. HOWLAND

HENRY CHARLES LEA PROFESSOR OF EUROPEAN HISTORY
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

WITH

AN INTRODUCTION BY

GEORGE LINCOLN BURR

PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS
Philadelphia
1939

COPYRIGHT 1939

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA PRESS

Manufactured in the United States of America

LONDON

HUMPHREY MILFORD

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

PART III.

THE DELUSION AT ITS HEIGHT.—*Continued.*

D. DEMONIACAL POSSESSION.

I. Notes from Various Writers.

In the ancient world the belief was almost universal that all disease was the work of demons, who must be conjured and persuaded or compelled to a cure—either to leave the patient or cease their malignant influence. Especially was this the case with mental disorders and the kindred epilepsy—the *sacer morbus*, with which were afflicted some of the demoniacs relieved by Christ, and of which Aretaeus tells us there was a popular belief that a demon had entered the sufferer. (See a remarkable paper by the Rev. John Naylor, in the *Hibbert Journal*, October, 1909). Tertullian (Apol. adv. Gentes, c. 23) shows how common was this possession and how complete was the power ascribed to Christians to expel the demon—"etiam de corporibus nostro imperio excedunt inviti et dolentes, et vobis praesentibus erubescentes."

In time, however, it would seem that a belief sprang up that the demon would only select the bodies of those suitable to him in which to take up his residence.—Balsamon, Scholia in Timothei Alexand. Responsa Canonica (Mag. Bibl. Patrum, IV, p. 1059).

Look up Weyer on demoniacs (De Praestig. Daemon., l. v, cc. 34 sqq). He does not deny the existence of possession, but holds that unlimited confidence is not to be reposed in the utterances of the demons, since the devil seeks to render the innocent suspect of sorcery.

Weyer tells of a case in 1552 at the nunnery of Kentorff, near Hamm in the county of Mark, where there was an epidemic of possession. Two women whom they accused were burnt as witches (q.v.).

The cases of Gauffridi and Grandier seem to connect with witchcraft the power of inducing possession and it may be worth while to refer to a striking case of this kind in Spain, long after the Inquisition had virtually decided that witchcraft was an illusion. In May or June, 1640, there was celebrated in Saragossa an auto-de-fe in which a well-known caballero named Pedro Arruebo appeared, sentenced to 200 lashes and the galleys because—"porque metió demonios en

316562

muchos lugares con quien tenia odio, y endemonió mas de mil y seiscientas personas."—Pellicer, Avisos históricos, 4 de Junio de 1640 (Valladares, Semanario Erudito, XXXI, p. 173).

There must have been an extensive epidemic of possession.

A curious case of possession among Catholics is related as occurring in Paderborn, in the spring of 1656. It was an epidemic pervading the whole bishopric and affected men and women, students, girls, and children. The demons in the bodies of the energumens called loudly for revenge against those who by witchcraft had sent them there, and especially against the burgomaster of Brackel and his servant girl Catherina, and Father Egidio, the guardian of the Capuchins. The Capuchins in consequence fell into such disrepute that they could no longer collect alms and had to carry clubs under their habits to protect themselves in the streets. The possessed were familiar with all languages and could answer questions in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, could predict the future and tell what was going on at a distance, besides disputing the highest questions in theology and philosophy. The maid Catherina was arrested and on July 7th her box was opened by the bishop's officials, and in it was found a toad, a small black bird, hair, needles, nut-shells and white bread. What was the upshot of the affair is not recorded.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., II, pp. 711–15.

Protestants had the same belief as Catholics as to sorcerers' sending demons to possess those whom they desired to injure. In the county of Montbéliard Protestantism was the dominant religion, and towards the end of the seventeenth century (1697) a shepherdess of Vernois was accused of having sent two demons to possess a young boy. The matter was judicially investigated and the pastor of Désdandans was called in to exorcise the patient. He ordered them to depart, but they refused point-blank, saying that they would go only at the time fixed by their master, Lucifer, to transfer themselves to Belfort, where they were to possess the daughter of a merchant at the demand of an old woman of Bavilliers. Bribery was then tried and they were offered plums, which they refused contemptuously, but they finally offered to go if given a thick broth, known as *paipai*, with the addition of eggs laid by a black fowl. After partaking of this dish, they departed whistling and the boy was cured, as was proved by his ability to recite the Lord's prayer. He seems to have been a cunning young rogue, who deserved the rod, and it

shows the deplorable state of mentality when all this is recorded as a formal judicial proceeding and when human lives were often sacrificed on such puerile grounds.—Tuetey, La Sorcellerie dans le Pays de Montbéliard (Dôle, 1886), pp. 87–8.

Pierre Bayle says very justly that a woman may very possibly persuade herself that some one has sent a devil to possess her. Then if she is asked whether the sorcerer whom she suspects has made some grimaces at her and murmured some words, and is told that he has caused others to be possessed, she at once concludes this to be the case and behaves like an energumen. Such is especially the case with nuns, who read much about histories of temptations and apparitions and attribute to Satan all the evil thoughts which assail them. He quotes Angela da Foligno's description of her sufferings, mental and bodily—devoured by fiery temptations, possessed by numerous demons, who beat every member of her body until it was swelled and sore and she could scarcely move or eat (Vit. B. Angelae Fulginens., c. 19—*ap.* Del Rio, l. ii, q. 25, pp. 216–17, and lib. iii, P. I, q. 4, sect. 5, p. 409); and all this he says we must accept as really experienced by her, through the effects of imagination.—Bayle, Reponse aux Questions d'un Provincial, c. 34 (*ap.* Meinders, Gedancken und Monita, Lemgo, 1716, pp. 16–18).

The latest cases of witchcraft, in the eighteenth century, were almost exclusively based on the assertions of demoniacs. It was so in that of Maria Renata in 1749 and also in that in Glarus in 1782.

Snell, Otto.—*Hexenprozess und Geistesstörung.* München, 1891.

Some modern alienists, such as Esquirol, adopt the explanation of Weyer that the witches were women of disordered brains. Snell argues against this and points out that in all the recorded trials not one can be found in which the victim was insane (pp. 82–3).

That there were hallucinated creatures is as old as Cap. Episcopi and is shown in the report to the Inquisition of Logroño—but that the great mass were sane and innocent even in intention is visible in the trials and in the recorded experience of Spee.

Snell says that melancholia is the most common form of mental disorder and he dwells on the tendency of melancholiacs to accuse themselves of crimes never committed and sometimes impossible for them to commit. One might therefore look for many self-accusers among witches, but such are not to be found. The Malleus alludes to no case of the kind;

Spee, among two hundred whom he confessed, found every one assert her innocence, but they begged him not to reveal it, as they preferred death to renewed torture; one of the accusations against the judge Balthasar Voss of Fulda was that large numbers whom he condemned asserted their innocence in confession to the priest. To this Snell adds some special cases, unnecessary to detail.—Ib., pp. 84–6.

He then considers the cases of self-accusation, which, though rare, are of importance as confirming belief in those who doubted witchcraft. Of these he enumerates a considerable number, including some who confessed without torture. (These latter I assume are of no import, for many would confess at once, knowing the endless torture that awaited denial. Snell subsequently dwells on this, pp. 92–3, and moreover we know how elastic was the expression "gutliche Bekenntniss" in the protocols.—H. C. L). Some cases, however, he has collected in which the individuals came forward spontaneously to denounce themselves and these were evidently deranged more or less. They come in the transition period when opposition was gaining ground.—Ib., pp. 86–92.

"We have then found individual cases in which melancholiacs spontaneously accused themselves of sorcery and were usually executed, but that these cases form an exceedingly minute portion of the prosecutions."—Ib., p. 94.

Snell evidently takes no stock in the modern suggestion of hypnosis in connection with such cases.

There are cases suggesting that some witches, through disordered minds, believed in the reality of their offences, viz. their behavior in confrontation with accomplices. It was not rare for them to demand to be confronted with those they said joined them in devil-worship, in order to induce them to confession. Connected with this are the not infrequent cases in which girls accused their mothers of being witches and of misleading their children to the Sabbat and devil-worship.—Ib., pp. 95–6.

The descriptions by witches of their sensations in intercourse with demons disprove the theory of Esquirol, von Lamberg, Schrader, Rosshirt and others that they were seduced by men disguised as demons. On the contrary, they have a strange similarity to the descriptions given by crazy women of their hallucinations of sensations. See also the mistaken opinion which women occasionally have of having been abused in anaesthesia from chloroform. The sensation of coitus is a

frequent symptom also of certain nervous disorders, especially at the commencement of *tabes dorsalis*. Deranged women very often imagine themselves to have been abused and their description of the suffering consequent bears a curious resemblance to that of the witches.—Ib., pp. 96–8.

The convulsions and insensibility which occurred under torture indicate that the witches were mentally disordered or hysterical. Insensibility of the skin and even of the whole body is a well known symptom of nervous and mental disorders. Snell's father found it to exist in 18 cases out of 180, or 10 per cent.—Ib., pp. 98–100.

Dermal insensibility is of frequent occurrence in hysteria, and Charcot says that the insensible areas are devoid of blood, so that a needle may be thrust in without drawing a drop. While this explains the *stigma diabolicum*, it is misleading to explain the insensibility so often shown by witches of disordered mind or severe neuroses, for thus far not a single case has been found in which such explanation is beyond doubt, and the explanation can always be sought in the fear of the fate entailed by confession. From the above it is evident that melancholiacs and those hallucinated could readily be suspected of pact with the devil.—Ib., pp. 101, 105.

Although there are cases in which under hallucination persons undertook to do remarkable things, those alienists like Calmeil are in error in ascribing disordered mentality to all those who confessed to the appearance of demons and flying to the Sabbat. In the most cases it is clear that the accused considered herself innocent and was forced by torture to confession. Even when the protocol states the confession to be voluntary, the judges gave a wide extension to that expression. Yet there are individual cases in which the existence of a disordered understanding is indubitable.—Ib., p. 106.

Soldan tells (Soldan-Heppe, I, p. 512) of a case in Amsterdam, in 1564, where a woman in a hospital in the delirium of fever raved about the devil and witches. Assumed to be a witch, sick as she was, she was imprisoned and, as she protested her innocence, she was shaved and tortured until she confessed renouncing God, intercourse with the devil and much evil inflicted on others, wherefore she was, on the fourth day after arrest, condemned to the stake. She died the next day and her corpse was duly burnt.—Ib., p. 107.

It was evidently a case of hallucination which is related by Bodin (Praefat., p. 230, and l. iv, c. 4, p. 421) of Catherine

Darea, near Soissons, in Feb. 1578, who cut off with a sickle the heads of two little girls—one her own child. On her trial she said the devil in the shape of a large dark man had appeared to her, given her the sickle and ordered her to do this. She was executed without making her confess, under torture, pact with the rest, a negligence of which Bodin does not approve.—Ibidem.

In 1636 at Königsberg a man announced that seven angels had appeared to him and informed him that he was to represent the person of God on earth and destroy all evil. He was arrested and the clergy were called in to disabuse him and assure him of perdition if he persisted. This failing, he was tortured, apparently to extort a confession of pact, but without avail. He was condemned to have his tongue torn out with hot pincers, to be quartered and then burnt, which was duly carried out, while he lamented, not his fate, but the blindness which ignored his mission.—Ib., pp. 107–8.

Antoinette Bourignon (born 1616 at Ryssel) from childhood was unsocial and given to devotion. Her parents refused to let her enter a nunnery and she lived as much as possible a cloistered life, converting her chamber into an oratory where she passed most of the night on her knees, holding intercourse with Christ. She had hallucinations of sight and hearing. Under an impulse to live in the desert she left her father's house and, after various adventures, was captured and brought back. Later she founded an institute for girls, where her hallucinations continued; once she saw little black demons hovering over her scholars. Once a girl of fourteen was shut up but escaped, and she concluded that it was with the devil's help. The idea spread and most of the girls, more than 50, declared that they could practise witchcraft and were consorts of the devil. Exorcisms were tried in which Jesuits and Capuchins quarrelled. She was accused of sorcery and imprisoned, but escaped condemnation by flight.—Ib., p. 109 (from Horst, Zauberbibliothek, I, pp. 225–9).

The last witch-trial in Prussia, in 1728, was of a girl of twenty-two with hallucinations. She was confined in the House of Correction for life with hard labor (see Soldan-Heppe, II, p. 268).—Ibidem.

An epileptic girl of eighteen was burnt alive as a witch, June 10, 1651. Three times the house in which she lived had been set on fire, and as a black man, assumed to be the devil, had been seen on the roof, she was suspected of the arson and of witchcraft. The proceedings describe her as

melancholic and epileptic and she had a falling attack while under torture. She freely confessed to the arson, which she said she was compelled to do; some one struck her eyes and commanded it, and she had no rest till she had done it. This she repeated some days later and said that when she was thus commanded she would have destroyed the whole world, and she had prayed God on her knees to bring her to judgment, as she was weary of life. Under torture she admitted pact with the devil. Snell says that this compulsion frequently occurs in epilepsy and, though the voice commanding things to be done is now commonly ascribed to the telephone, there are still cases in which the hallucination to commit some crime is ascribed to the devil.—Ib., pp. 110–11.

In 1881 a man who inherited epilepsy, after a puncture of the lungs developed attacks of cerebral trouble. During the attacks he saw the devil in the shape of a shining dog and heard him speak. Once he threw a lighted oil-lamp in the bed of his child and was repeatedly urged to suicide, and finally, at the express command of the devil, he murdered a boy. On the trial two experts pronounced him irresponsible, but the jury found him guilty. He was condemned to death, but this was commuted to confinement for life in a House of Correction.—Ib., p. 111.

Snell considers Magdalene de la Palud (1611) an hysteric, with hallucinations of the devil.—Ib., p. 114.

In Friedeberg in the Neumark, in 1593, there were in all 150 persons possessed. Perhaps this has some connection with the fact that then, for the first time, there was zealous preaching against the devil. Public prayers were ordered to check the evil, but without effect except to increase the contagion. As soon as a person became possessed in a place, there followed other cases.

In this epidemic the reports clearly show that the attention paid to the matter increased the affection. Some close observers saw that the exorcisms administered made the sufferers worse. Luther went to the other extreme when he soundly kicked a demoniac brought to him, in order to show his contempt for the devil, but his treatment was more successful than that of the exorcisers.—Ib., p. 116.

In the psychiatric clinic of Jena, in 1883, a patient was received suffering from *chorea major*. In a few days she had to be removed from the ward as other patients, and even a nurse, were attacked with movements of the extremities.—Ib., p. 117.

Charcot tells of a neuropathic family in which a girl of thirteen, who frequented spiritualistic sittings, had strong hysteric convulsions when she served as a medium, and these recurred from twenty to fifty times a day. Six weeks later, her brother of eleven was attacked in the same way, and a few days later a still younger brother. The attacks were worse when the children were together and diminished when they were separated.—Ibidem.

Briquet relates, after Bailly, that in a church during Mass a young girl had an hysterical convulsion, and within half an hour fifty or sixty women were attacked, and he quotes from Boerhaave that in a children's hospital and a boarding-school all the inmates were attacked with hysterical convulsions from which a girl suffered.—Ibidem.

The symptoms of hysteria are the same as those described in possession—the convulsions, the opisthotonos, often tympanitis, indecent movements, and difficulty in swallowing.—Ib., p. 118.

See Weyer, De Praestig., lib. iv, c. 15, for theories and cases of foreign bodies vomited or ejected by demoniacs and caused by witchcraft.

As late as 1717 a physician, Dr. Gockel, in his "Tractatus polyhistoricus Magico-Medicus curiosus," says that sorcerers and witches do much evil by conjuring all sorts of things into the bodies of people, such as wood, needles, knives, glass, hair, eggshells, woolen and linen cloths, *Glufen* [gloves?], nails, balls of thread, yarn, stones, and the like, and that these things come to sight through the various openings of the body or in the sores and ulcers caused by sorcery.—Ib., p. 119.

Lange, in his "Histoire de la fille maleficiée de Courson" (written in 1717), tells of a girl of twenty-two who fell sick after quarrelling with a woman reputed as a witch, and vomited a lizard and a number of caterpillars, all living. Soon afterwards the same woman struck her three blows with a stick and, on lancing the bruises, there came out a needle and two pins, and later fifty-two pins.—Ib., pp. 119–20.

This scarcely is a case of possession.

Dr. Gockel also recites from Weyer the case of thirty boys of Amsterdam, in 1566, exorcised for possession, who suffered atrocious pains and convulsions as though insane, and vomited thimbles, rags, bits of pottery, glass, hair, and other rubbish of the devil.—Ib., p. 120.

Gockel likewise tells of a nine-year-old girl who ate a sorrel leaf given to her by a witch, and had pains and fainting fits. On being exorcised she vomited horse-dung, needles, feathers,

hair, balls of thread, bits of glass, an iron knife a span long, egg-shells, mussel shells, and the like.—Ibidem.

The vomiting or passing of foreign bodies attributed to sorcery is explicable by "allotriophagy," a recognized symptom in deranged persons and especially of hysterics and idiots, who swallow needles and the like, sometimes with the view of self-destruction. A case related by Bodin (l. ii, c. 8, *q. v.*) and Weyer (l. iv, c. 9) illustrates this. A peasant named Neusesser of Fugenthal suffered severe pains in the side. On lancing the spot a large iron nail was found. The pains continued and he cut his throat. By an autopsy there were found in the stomach a large round piece of wood, four knives, two sharp iron tools each more than a span long, and a ball of hair—which was naturally attributed to sorcery, but the peasant was evidently a melancholiac who had swallowed them with a view to self-destruction before adopting the more efficacious method.[1]—Ibidem.

Van Andel reports that on August 31, 1864, there was admitted to the insane hospital of Zutphen a sixty-four-year old melancholiac woman who had swallowed a silver fork two days previous. On June 12, 1865, the fork appeared in an abscess three fingers broad which had formed to the left of the navel. The fistula first discharged feces, and was healed by July 14. He quotes a similar case of a girl of nineteen who swallowed two iron forks, which ten months later were discharged through an ulcer in the lower belly, when healing commenced. In December, 1890, at the Munich insane hospital a girl of nineteen died of pneumonia after she had for two months refused nourishment and had been fed with a tube. She had chewed and swallowed a rosary with a metal cross.—Ib., p. 121.

Among hysterics the swallowing of indigestible objects, especially of needles, is extremely common, and it is not unusual for them to insert them in other orifices and to stick them in the skin, especially in the breast and pudenda. Valentiner says we might almost call it an idiosyncrasy of the will when we find among endless hysterics the desire to attract attention and on that account to deceive the physician and those around them. It is surprising that the kind of deceit chosen is almost always the same. We constantly find the recurrence of swallowing needles, bits of glass, etc., and then vomiting them, of sticking needles in the skin and of making it appear that they require no food and pass no urine.—Ib., pp. 121–2.

[1] This case also given by Remy.

Anesthesia and analgesia are frequently reported of the possessed. Martha Brossier, who was exorcised in 1599, had no feeling when needles were thrust into her. Needles could be thrust under the finger nails of Soeur Denise, one of the nuns possessed in a convent of Auxerre, in 1662, without paining her.—Ib., p. 122.

Analgesia, frequent with the insane, and also sometimes described among demoniacs, is especially frequent in hysteria, and is one of its characteristic symptoms. Briquet found hemianesthesia (over half of body) in 93 and general anesthesia in 240 of 400 observed cases. Gendrin holds (1875) that partial or total anesthesia is a constant symptom of hysteria, from commencement to end. Recent accurate observations by Thomsen and Oppenheim find it in 26 out of 28 cases. Jolly reports a case of a hysteric who in the excitement of a hallucination opened an oven door and applied the burning coals with her hand to the pudenda. The hallucinations ceased on the spot, but she felt no pain either at the time or during the long cure of the burns.—Ib., pp. 122–3.

The tympanitis which was a frequent occurrence in demoniacs (Weyer, l. iv, c. 15, Bodin. l. ii, c. 8) often accompanies hysteria, both at its commencement and during its course. Charcot says it sometimes leads to errors in diagnosis, when other symptoms are absent, and cites a case of a woman of twenty-three in whom it was attributed to abdominal tumor, for which an operation was resolved upon; but, when chloroform was administered, with the narcosis it suddenly disappeared. Bourneville tells of a girl of seventeen placed in the hospital of Poitiers for hysteria. The belly was swelled, the menses irregular, she ate sparingly and often vomited; the nuns reproached her and transferred her to the maternity ward, where it was recognized as *metiorismus hystericus*.—Ib., pp. 123–4.

The sudden changes which sometimes supervene through mental impressions, in the affections caused by hysteria, explain the reliance placed on exorcism, relics and the like, though these often aggravate the disease. Charcot had a case in which a four years' contraction of one of the legs disappeared suddenly when he sharply scolded the patient for some misconduct and threatened to dismiss her from the hospital. In another case a contraction was cured when he struck the patient, who was accused of theft. Briquet tells of a hysteria of twenty years' standing suddenly cured when the patient was accused of being pregnant—and a whole series of similar cases.

We thus see that the so-called possessed, almost without exception, were hysteric or mentally disordered. When men sought the cause of possession in witchcraft, these patients led to countless cases of prosecution. What between the melancholics who imagined themselves to be witches and the hysterics who were held to be possessed, it can be seen how large an amount of witch-persecution is attributable to these mental disorders.—Ib., pp. 124–5.

The cases which I have in the *Inquisition of Spain* of women accusing themselves of commerce with demons may be explicable by hysteric erotic dreams, but this does not explain a very curious case in the transcripts from French libraries sent me by Ch. Du Bos.

On May 12, 1647, Jeanne Alhumbert, thirty-four years old, daughter of the late Michel Alhumbert, laborer of the village of Poizat and of Claude Bruna, presents herself to the magistrates of Nantua (Dép. Ain) "'pour se convertir à Dieu et se faire bruler.' Elle déclare s'être donnée au démon, avoir assisté au sabbat dans les bois de la montagne de Sauzey, avoir vu le diable tantôt sous la forme d'un homme, tantôt sous celle d'un bouc, avoir renoncé par son ordre au baptême, à sa part de paradis, à la Vierge Marie, à tous les saints et à l'Eglise, avoir été marquée par lui sous le pied gauche, avoir jeté un malefice sur l'enfant de son frère, etc., (pas d'autre détail)." The trial proceeds in regular form, interrogations, depositions of witnesses, etc., including an examination of the witchmark, of which a drawing is given, and finally results in the sentence, "La dite accusée sera livrée aux mains de l'exécuteur de la haute justice, menée en chemise et pieds nus au devant de la grande porte de l'église paroissiale de Nantua, tenant en main une torche ardente et là fera amende honorable, dira et declarera que par une abominable impiété elle a oublié Dieu, l'a renoncé, s'est laissée séduire et tromper par le diable, l'a servy et adoré, s'en repent et demande pardon à Dieu, au Roy et à Justice, et ce fait sera conduite par ledit exécuteur au lieu accoutumé pour y estre pendue et étranglée à un potence que pour cet effet y sera dressée, et son corps mort ars et brulé et la cendre jettée au vent."—Bibliothèque de Lyon, 2152, Justice de Nantua.

II. Exorcists and Exorcisms.

The still existing documents of a case in Vienna, 1583, show that a sixteen-year-old girl of Mank in the Viertl above the Wiener Wald suffered from cramps. She was pronounced to be possessed and was sent to Vienna, where she was exor-

cised in the Jesuit chapel of St. Barbara. After eight weeks of labor the Jesuits expelled 12,652 living demons. She chanced to mention that she often accompanied her grandmother, Elisabeth Pleinacher, to weddings and church consecrations, but only in Lutheran places; so she was brought to state that her grandmother had kept the demons in the shape of flies in glass bottles and had made them take possession of her. The Viennese Bishop, Kaspar Neubeck, had the grandmother, a woman of seventy, imprisoned and tortured until she confessed to him that it was so and that the devil had intercourse with her in the shape of a goat, or of a little cat, and often as a ball of thread; that for fifty years she had frequented the Sabbat; and that by her inducement the devil had entered an apple which she had given her granddaughter to eat. Whereupon she was tied to a horse's tail, dragged to the Richtplatz at Erdberg near Vienna, and there burnt alive. On the thirteenth Sunday after Pentecost, 1583, the Jesuit Georg Scherer preached a long sermon descriptive of the case, of which printed copies are still existent. It is dedicated to the Viennese magistrates, exhorting them to increased diligence in the suppression of witchcraft. In this sermon he stated that the demons sometimes made themselves so heavy that the girl could scarce be carried from place to place. The waggoner who brought her daily from the hospital to the chapel of St. Barbara complained of it and said she must be made of lead and iron; and the horses, though strong, would be covered with sweat.—Holzinger, Naturgeschichte der Hexen (Graz, 1883), pp. 35–7.

The business of exorcising was too profitable not to be exploited also among Protestants. Wandering practitioners, popularly known as *Teufels-Banner*, tramped around and speculated on the superstitions inherited by the people. One of these, a blind man named Simon Moller, came to Osnabrück in 1562 and drove a thriving business, but came to a bad end the next year, for his wife cut off his head and one arm, for which she was duly tortured into confession and executed by a combination of the wheel and fire.—Hauber, Bibl. Magica, I, p. 493.

Weyer includes among magicians the ignorant exorcizers who impute disease to sorcery and defame the innocent by indicating those who have cast the spell. "Caeterum magorum plurimi professione sunt religiosi quos vocant. Qui occultam mentiti artem maleficii dignationem curationemque jactare non verentur. Nam si morbo aliquo contumaci,

imperitae plebi ignoto, nec vulgari quis conflictetur, atque eorum fictae confisus scientiae, consilium quaerat, maleficium esse vel incantationem persuadent morbum ex naturali causa ortum medicisque doctioribus non obscurum; additis etiam indiciis quibus velut digito commonstratur innocens saepe femina. Morbum hac ratione comminiscuntur et invincibilem calumniam insonti impingunt, illusores utroque nomine non modo inter perniciosissimas iniqui quaestus ἁρπῆας (harpies), adulterinae monetae (quod pietatis praetextu alios inescent et daemonio devoveant offerantque) architectos et falsarios reputandi, verum etiam illis qui libellos spargunt famosos annumerandi, et velut civilis ne dicam publicae tranquillitatis turbatores censendi, si hoc controversiarum et atrocissimorum odiorum, quibus miserrime conflictantur intonantque viciniae, pagi et urbes, feracissimum seminarium, ad justam trutinetur bilancem."—De Praestigiis Daemonum, l. vi, c. 1, §8 (ed. Amstelod., 1660, p. 462).

Del Rio admits the abuses of the exorcizers, "Quoniam nonnullis in locis multi abusus irrepsere in exorcismos legitimos et Catholicos, contra Apostolicae Romanae Ecclesiae consuetudinem." Suspect of pact with the demon are those who without authority assume the function, whether laymen or clerics, claiming peculiar powers by the grace of God, and those religious and others who assume peculiar supernatural virtue greater than others. It is a device of the demon to pretend to be ejected by them in their public exorcisms. He defames the innocent and reveals the hidden crimes of the guilty. All are to be warned to place no faith in the father of lies. Exorcizers should be warned not to interrogate the demon from motives of curiosity; there should be no familiarity with him nor should aid or counsel be sought of him. The same should be observed by the exorcizers of clouds and hail-storms and of destructive insects.—Del Rio, Disq. Mag., l. vi, anacephalaeosis, monit. 10 (pp. 1051–3).

Bodin relates that in 1554 in Rome eighty-two women were possessed, whom a French Benedictine vainly endeavored to exorcize; the next day the devils, on being asked, said that they had been sent into them by the Jews, who were enraged that the women (mostly of Jewish birth) had accepted baptism. The next year Paul IV was so irritated that he proposed to banish all the Jews, but a Jesuit dissuaded him, arguing that no man could send a devil into another's body. On the other hand, in the convent of Kentorff in Germany, all the nuns were possessed by demons, who said it was done

by Elisabeth Kama, the cook. She confessed that she was a sorceress who by her prayers and sacrifices had done it, and for this she was burnt.—Bodin, De Magorum Daemonomania, l. ii, c. 3 (p. 146).

The body of St. Anthony of Padua is so feared by demons that there are few demoniacs who approach his relics without being delivered.—Valderama, Hist. gen. du Monde, l. iii, P. II, c. 9 (II, p. 378).

The Protestant Godelmann classes the papal exorcizers among *incantatores;* and, as Aretius says, they are mostly *magi*, endeavoring with ceremonies, charms, execrations, and using the names of God, the Virgin, and saints to drive out malignant spirits from men, beasts, and houses—and he proceeds to detail their operations at length.—Godelmann, De Magis, l. i, c. 6, nn. 21–8.

And in this he is not alone, for he quotes various other Protestant writers in support.

Domingo Soto has no scruple in denouncing exorcists and demoniacs as mostly frauds. "Maxima ex parte . . . sunt mere impostores [exorcistae], ut ego ipse plurimorum sum oculatus testis, saepe nam fingunt daemonia inde ejicere ubi nullum est; atque adeo plurimae mulierculae daemonio obsideri mentiuntur lucri causa, dicentes esse animas defunctorum quas infamant. Et ideo nisi aliquod intercesserit daemonii documentum quod sit efficax nulla est eis habenda fides, nempe nisi dum lingua loquantur peregrina vel adeo immobiles existant ut multis hominum viribus dimoveri loco nequeant."—Soto, De Justitia et Jure, l. viii, q. 3, art. 2 (Venetiis, 1594, p. 797).

Carena points out that exorcists cannot perform their functions without episcopal authority, which ought to be sparingly given. Card. Federigo Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, in his extensive province only granted it to four or six men of conspicuous learning and piety.—Carena, Annotationes in Instr. Rom., §5, n. 7 (De Officio S. Inq., p. 494).

The Instructions of the Roman Inquisition, §6, warn judges not to be deceived by impostures, for "diversimode se obsessos esse simulant, saepe enim hujusmodi impostores reperiuntur."—Ib., §6, n. 1 (p. 494).

Although by no means all obsessions were attributable to witchcraft, for in many cases it was by the spontaneous action of the demon, with God's permission or by his command, still those in which the demon was sent by sorcery were sufficiently numerous to require especial attention by demonologists.

Lessius says that if a demon in an energumen asserts that he will convict Titius of a crime if brought before him, the judge can have him brought, if he has already been accused or if there are other *indicia*, but the demon is not to be asked to convict him; he is merely to be confronted to see what results, permitting the demon to say what he wants or what God compels him to say. Lessius adds that the demoniac may be brought into court if he says he will there point out a criminal. Now against this is that there seems here to be some communication with the demon. Moreover, there seems to be a moral coöperation in this manifestation of the demon, and it is not awful to ask a *magus* to point out a thief, and if a *magus* offers to convict Titius of theft, the judge cannot order Titius to be brought, for this would be to consent to the unlawful act of the *magus;* thus, as one certainly sins who furnishes material for the operations of a *magus*, as holding the mirror in which the thief is to be shown, so the judge would be morally coöperating with the demon.—La Croix, Theologia Moralis, l. vi, n. 1432 (Ravennae, 1761, II, p. 119).

"Judex peccat si apprehendat aliquem a daemone denuntiatum, v. g. in energumeno."—Ib., n. 1450 (p. 121).

"Non semper est habenda fides exorcistis nec dicentibus se daemonium habere, nisi aliquod signum efficax sit, quia saepe utrique decipiuntur, vel impostores sunt." The best sign is the use of a language of which the demoniac is ignorant.—Th. Sanchez, In Praecepta Decalogi, l. ii, c. 42, n. 9 (Lugduni, 1661, p. 312).

No material substance has power to expel demons, for they are spirits and unaffected by material things. There are remedies which may afford relief to the demoniac, but it is superstitious to suppose that the demon is reached by them. For this he cites numerous authorities, including Thyraeus, cap. 48.—Ib., n. 10 (p. 312).

Compare this with the rue and multitudinous other things recommended by Visconti—and the sulphureous suffumigations which strangle the patient. It is very curious to read the discussions of these learned theologians who lay down with a sense of absolute certitude all the details of human relations with demons and of what man can and cannot do in his dealings with them, and the extent to which his pact with superior demons may enable him to control those of an inferior order.

The power over possession is based on Luke, x, 17, "And the seventy returned again with joy saying, 'Lord, even the

316562

devils are subject to us through thy name,'" and Luke, xvi, 17, "In my name shall they cast out devils," also Luke, ix, 1, "Then he called his twelve disciples together and gave them power and authority over all devils."

The power of exorcism—"exorcismi non ex opere operantis solo sed ex opere operato habent eam vim daemonis expellendi."—Sanchez, *op. cit.*, n. 16 (p. 313).

As for the scourgings and beatings administered by the exorcist to the energumen there is difference of opinion. Simancas says (De Cath. Instt., tit. 63, n. 32) that it is an error to believe that demons can be expelled by such means or by smoke, and that they only pretend to suffer in order to deceive fools and that the bodies of the demoniacs may be tortured. Del Rio (Disq. Mag., l. ii, q. 30, sect. 3) very reasonably says that the patient is thus only rendered worse and more subject to the demon. Thyraeus, on the other hand (De Daemoniacis, P. III, c. 46, n. 665), holds that scourging, though rarely to be employed, yet is sometimes to be used; for it confounds the demons greatly, as they assume it to be in their contempt and there are conditions of the body which it removes. The cries and groans of the unlucky victim were assumed to be those of the demon (n. 640). In this difference of opinion Sanchez says that if these scourgings and suffumigations are intended directly to expel or afflict the demon, they are superstitious; but they are licit if they are to show contempt for him and by wounding his pride lead him to depart. But the exorcist is imprudent if he molests too greatly the patient with scourging and smoking.—Sanchez, *op. cit.*, nn. 29–30 (pp. 314–15).

It is licit to agree to the demon's terms for departing, if nothing wrong is done thereby, as with Christ and the Gadarene swine (Luke, viii, 30–3).—Thyraeus, *ubi sup.*, c. 50, nn. 716–20; Sanchez, *loc. cit.*, n. 36.

Casimir Florian Czartoriski, Bishop of Cujavia and Pomerania, in a pastoral of April 11, 1669, promulgating the Roman Instructions of 1657, is severe on the abuses committed by exorcists in interrogating energumens and proclaiming witches and their works as thus discovered by them. He therefore ordered that in future no one should exercise the office [of exorcist] without a written license from him, under pain of *ipso facto* excommunication. Any one not thus authorized was to be reported by the parish priest to the episcopal Official; if he refused obedience, the nearest dean

was authorized to arrest him, calling in the secular arm if necessary, and bring him to the Official, and all people were forbidden to employ him.—Festschrift of the Albertine University, Königsberg, 1821 (see Appendix).

Clement August of Bavaria, Archbishop of Cologne and Bishop of Paderborn, Hildesheim, Osnabrück and Münster, in his autumnal diocesan synod of Münster (1752) inveighs energetically against the abuses of venal exorcists who to gain money assume natural diseases to be diabolic possession caused by sorcery and incantations, to the irreparable injury of those whom they accuse as authors of it. Wherefore, even as he had already provided in his archdiocese of Cologne, following the example of his predecessor, Maximilian Heinrich of Bavaria (1643–1688), he orders that under pain of *ipso facto* suspension no one shall exorcise without a special written license to be obtained from him or his vicar, and then he must strictly follow the Roman Ritual or the new Agenda of Münster or other approved form.—Synod. Autumnal. Monasteriensis, ann. 1752 (Hartzheim, Concil. Germaniae, X, p. 585).

Felix Joseph Hubert de Wavrans, Bishop of Ypres, in a Pastoral Instruction of 1768, says that the persons "quae per infestationes daemonum aut incantationum maleficia divexantur" are much fewer than are popularly believed. He speaks of the frauds and deceptions of the exorcisers and the neglect of the provident provisions of his predecessors, notably of Guillaume Delvaux (1732–61), prohibiting all exorcism without written license of the Ordinary, and renews them under heavy penalties.—Instructio Pastoralis Iprensis, cc. 155, 156 (Hartzheim, X, p. 661).

Menghi, Girolamo.—*Flagellum Daemonum* (printed in the Thesaurus Exorcismorum, Colon. 1626, pp. 236–432).

————.—*Fustis Daemonum* (Thesaurus Exorcism., pp. 433–617).

————.—*Compendio dell' Arte Essorcistica*. Bologna, 1580 (first ed., 1576).

Graesse also names an independent work of Menghi, *Eversio Daemonum e corporibus oppressis*, Bononiae, 1588.

Menghi was one of the most authoritative writers on Exorcism. His Flagellum Daemonum is often cited by subsequent demonologists. The earliest edition cited by Grässe is Bononiae, 1578;[1] then Lugduni, 1653, and Frankfort, 1708 and 1709. Besides, it is in both editions of the The-

[1] Hurter gives an edition Bononiae, 1577.

saurus Exorcismorum, Colon., 1608 and 1626. His Fustis Daemonum was equally sought after—Bononiae 1589; s.l., 1621, and Frankfort, 1708—and is likewise in both eds. of the Thesaurus Exorcismorum.

I have somewhere seen it stated that in the Flagellum the exorcist was instructed to ask the name of the sorcerer in cases of possession through sorcery. This would seem not to be the case. In the instructions as to the questions to be put to the demons is "Si sint aliquo pacto vel maleficio ibi ligati; quomodo illud maleficium possit destrui;" but nothing about the sorcerer (Flagellum Daemonum, c. 4).

The exorcist should make diligent search in the bedding and bedclothes, in every corner of the house and under the threshold, to find the *signa*, which are to be burnt when found. It is expedient to change all garments and bedclothes, and also the house, for this often conduces to liberation.—Ib., c. 7 (Thesaurus Exorcismorum, p. 250).

In the "Fustis" he tells us that the demons generally convey and hide these sorceries made by the sorcerer and renew them every month, so that constant and repeated search must be made. He tells a case occurring in 1582 in Bologna of a parish priest afflicted with a disease and bed-ridden for months, without relief by physicians. By advice of an exorcist his bed was opened and in it were found "multa instrumenta maleficialia," which were duly burnt. A month later it was examined again, with the same result, and this was repeated over and over again, until at last the patient recovered. (From the way this is told it may be presumed that Menghi was the exorcist.—H. C. L.) A good preventive is to take gold, frankincense, myrrh, exorcized salt, olives, blessed wax and rue, all severally blessed and put in papers marked with three crosses, and place one at each corner of the bed.—Fustis Daemonum, c. 18 (Thesaurus, pp. 469–70).

Polidori, Valerio.—*Practica Exorcistarum ad Daemones et Maleficia de Christi fidelibus pellendum.* (In Thesaurus Exorcismorum, Colon. 1626, pp. 1–235.)

There is an edition of this, Patavii, 1587,[1] and another Venetiis, 1606. It is also in an earlier edition of the Thesaurus Exorcism., Colon., 1608.

"Sunt itaque Malefici et multi sunt, nam crevit eorum quin etiam et Maleficarum muliercularum numerus diebus nostris ita immensum ut eorum abhominationibus terra repleatur, et nullus sit qui talium effectus noxios non agnoscat."—P. II, Praefat., c. 1 (p. 164).

Diabolical possession occurs in two ways. First, with the

[1] An earlier edition, Patavii, 1582, is mentioned by Hurter.

permission of God, the demon enters of his own will. "Vel secundo, permittente Deo, Malefico sive Malefica, suis incantationibus ipsum alliciendo, invocando et inhabitationem intentam insinuando." That this really occurs is shown by a case quoted from the Malleus.—Ib., c. 3 (p. 165).

The diagnosis of possession by *maleficium* is that in addition to the ordinary signs the body and limbs are swelled and the victim can scarcely move; sometimes the face is cedar-colored and there are pains of different kinds in the limbs; the heart seems to be compressed or pricked, or as if gnawed by a dog; the orifice of the stomach seems constricted; digestion ceases and food is vomited; a ball seems to rise from the stomach and descend; there is severe colic in the lower belly and wind seems to pass, sometimes very cold and sometimes burning. There is also a loss of reasoning power and idiocy, at intervals, sometimes longer or shorter. And these are the most decisive signs that the possession is caused by *maleficium.*—Ib., c. 4 (pp. 166–7).

One source of cure is God, who, as he permits the *maleficium,* so in his goodness can remove it at will. The other source is twofold—by angels or by man. The angelic cure also is twofold—first, a good angel of power superior to that of the evil one causing the *maleficium* can order him to remove it; secondly, an evil angel of superior power can order the inferior one to relieve the obsessed. The human cure is by the exorcist, who by the authority granted to his office by God is accustomed to rebuke the devil and destroy the *maleficium.* There are two methods—one lawful and the other unlawful. The lawful is that prescribed by the Master of Sentences, lib. iv, dist. 34 [a double procedure]—the possessed is to satisfy God by confession, tears, almsgiving, prayer and fasting, and then the ministers of the Church will attend to curing him with exorcisms and other resources of ecclesiastical discipline. There is also that of Scotus, IV Sentt., dist. 34, q. 1, [who says] that if the hiding place of the *signum materiale* can be found, it should be destroyed, when the devil will cease to persecute the obsessed, because the pact is that the possession shall last only as long as the *signum.* These, with remedies to be described, are what is lawful to use in liberating the bewitched. The unlawful methods are three—using sorcery to destroy sorcery, transferring the *maleficium* to another, and invoking the demon to repress the *maleficium.*—Ib., c. 5 (pp. 167–8).

As for the use of natural remedies and agents, the question is twofold. If applied with the intention of operating directly on the demon, this is unlawful, for no natural and material objects can affect him. But, if applied with the view of strengthening the body, it is lawful, especially the use of blessed things.—Ib., c. 6 (pp. 168–9).

The phrase in the above—"et sic non licet, quoniam nulla virtus naturalis talium materialium remediorum et medicamentorum in Diabolum agere potest"—I repeat, because it seems to be contradicted in a passage below. In fact, this is scarce to be understood unless it is confined to the natural virtues of material things and not to these after due prayer and exorcism—see below under suffumigation.

The remedies to be outwardly applied are, first, *brevia* appended to the neck, inscribed with Scripture texts or the names of God. Then there are things which affect the sense of smell and of touch, vegetable and otherwise, fetid and not fetid, "ut fumigationes quaedam quae duplices sunt. Primae adversantur spiritualibus malis et maleficio: secundae vero maleficio et malis spiritibus." Then there are water and oil applied to the skin and baths. All of which will be particularly described in the first section of the work.—Ib., c. 7 (pp. 169–70).

Then come remedies to be taken internally—food and medicine—to be described hereafter.—Ib., c. 8 (pp. 170–1).

As it is no part of the function of priest and exorcizer to be skilled in medicine, "consulto faciendum esse judicavi ut applicationes medicamentorum non fiant nisi per medicos quibus remedia proponantur."—Ib., c. 9 (p. 172).

There are three principal signs which show that the bewitched is released from possession: the first is when something like a flame of fire passes out from the mouth, the ears or *per secessum*; the second is when an icy wind passes out similarly; the third when from the same orifices there pass bristles, worms, ants, frogs, or mice. Then he is known to be liberated.—Ib., c. 10 (p. 172).

Tobit, vi, 8, shows that the smoke of the dried heart of the fish "driveth away all kinds of devils," and the philosophers teach that the smoke of some plants does the same. He therefore gives two formulae, the first against evil spirits and the second as destructive to sorceries—though either may be used for either purpose. The first is 6 drachms each of seed of hypericum, rue, and incense; the second is 1 drachm each of frankincense, storax, galbanum, laudanum and gario-

filum, with 2 grains musk. Then these are duly exorcized and prayed over.—Ib., P. I, Praefat., c. 17 (p. 24).

These may be endurable, but not so some of the practices prescribed as follows:

"Quantum ex aptis visibilibus appositis maligni spiritus qui in humanis corporibus resident excrucientur acerbe, experientia testatur." Some of these are to show the demon contempt, others to repress him. Contempt is shown by making him reveal his name and by writing it on parchment in large capital letters and exhibiting it to him; also by drawing on parchment an image of him, horrible and foul, and showing it to him, holding up the stole or a blessed olive branch, with blows and kicks and spitting and insulting gestures and fetid suffumigations. For these latter, light a new fire with flint and steel and exorcise it and sprinkle it with holy water, and then use for the suffumigation 2 ounces each of rue, attic aster, sulphur, and asafetida, after they have been duly exorcized and prayed over. (Another "profumigatio horribilis" consists of a drachm each of galbanum, sulphur, asafetida, aristolochia, hypericum, and rue—see P. II, p. 185.) The demon may also be tormented by showing him the Eucharist and images of God, the Virgin, and the saints.—Ib., c. 16 (pp. 21–4).

What between beating and choking with sulphur and asafetida, it is no wonder that unlucky energumens were sometimes done to death by a too zealous exorcist.

Formula of exorcism for salt to be carried by the possessed.—Ib., P. II (p. 173).

Benediction customarily made on Epiphany, of gold, frankincense, and myrrh to be carried.—Ib., p. 174.

Exorcism of squills (*quae planta est*) to be carried.—Ib., p. 177.

Exorcism of seed of hypericum (p. 182) to be carried. Two of rue (p. 184).

Exorcism and conjuration of paper on which are to be written briefs and hung around the neck to drive away demons and destroy the sorcery.—Ib., pp. 178, 179.

Examples of briefs to be thus written (p. 180):

"Jesus Nazarenus Rex Judaeorum. Verbum caro factum est et habitavit in nobis, et vidimus gloriam ejus, gloriam quasi unigeniti a Patre, plenum gratiae et Veritatis."

"Ecce crucem Domini † fugite partes adversae: vicit Leo de tribu Juda: radix David. Alleluia: Alleluia."

This latter is known as the Breve St. Antonii de Padua, it having been miraculously conveyed by the saint to a possessed woman of Santarem who invoked him.

Exorcisms of olive oil wherewith to anoint the sufferer (pp. 188, 189).

This anointing is to be continued for eight or ten days, and as each spot is touched with the oil—eyes, forehead, ears, breast, etc.—the exorciser repeats: "Ego ungo te N. hoc oleo benedicto et per istam unctionem absolvo te † ab omnibus maleficiis, incantationibus, ligaturis, signaturis et facturis, tibi arte diabolica factis. In nomine Pa † tris et Fi † lii et Spiritus † Sancti. Amen." (p. 191).

A "potio ad omne maleficium indifferenter solvendum et Diabolum conterendum" is made of "½ drachm of seeds of the herb. paris. and quant. suff. of decoction of borage," with appropriate formulas of exorcism and prayer (p. 219).

Then there are four formulas for clysters to be taken on successive days, with subsequent ones for internal remedies and unguents, with appropriate exorcisms and prayers, for cases of frenzy produced by sorcery (p. 221).

Then, to induce vomiting of the *signa* supposed to be in the stomach there is a recipe of 1 pound of broth, 3 ounces of oxymel, and some vinegar, with the exorcisms and prayers, and after this is accomplished there are benediction and prayers for the fire in which to burn them, followed by an exorcized tisane of barley-water to comfort the stomach (pp. 231–4).

Why was rue considered so objectionable to demons and witches? There are prayers and exorcisms and a "Benedictio rutae, in charta benedicta praedicta, super se portandae et olfaciendae ad omnem invasionem Diabolicam et maleficam repellendam" (pp. 183–4).

This work is not, as it might seem, a mere catch-penny production to get fees by exploiting popular credulity. Valerio Polidori was a Franciscan and a doctor of theology, and in the Preface to his book he is urgent in requiring the exorcist to be firm in the faith and absolutely pure in conscience, otherwise he cannot expect God to listen to his prayers and grant his appeals. So he is not to use the devil for gain by demanding fees for his services, for this is simoniacal and weakens the influence of his prayers with God and his power of inspiring the devil with fear. But what alms are tendered to him voluntarily he is at liberty to receive. Moreover, he is to beware of vainglory; whatever success he has is attributable to God and not to him (P. I, Praefat., cc. 2–5, pp. 2–4).

STAMPA, PIERO ANTONIO.—*Fuga Satanae.* Como, 1597, Venetiis, 1605 (Thesaurus Exorcis., pp. 984–1054).

Graesse names an edition of this, Lugduni, 1619.

The burning of the sorceries was not a simple matter. A fire is to be prepared and sulphur and pitch provided. Then various sacred texts are read and a prayer offered, "Ut sicut comburentur haec diabolica instrumenta sic auferatur malitia per ipsa illata et infundatur servo Dei N. sanitas optata." Then follow various other texts, addressed partly to the demon and partly to God. Then a long benediction of the fire, with prayer, and sprinkling with holy water, after which the sulphur and pitch are thrown on to it in four portions, each with an appropriate text, and finally the sorceries.—Ib., §18 (Thesaurus Exorcis., pp. 1024–9).

Suffumigation is conducted according to the same formula, except as to the mode of casting the sulphur and pitch on to the fire. The patient is to be held over it so that the fumes may reach his nostrils. The author, however, wisely remarks that this is to be administered rarely and cautiously, lest we bring graver disease on those we seek to help.—Ib., §19 (p. 1030).

Write the name of the demon on paper, or, if he will not reveal it, then impose on him any appropriate name or epithet—*Beelzebub, Draco, Bestia, Mendax, Spiritus nequam,* and throw it on the fire prepared as above with portions of the above ceremonies. Or, if an image is to be burnt, make an image of the demon, with his name, and another of the sorcerer with the name of *pytho, magus, maleficus, striga,* or the like; then throw them on the fire with some appropriate texts from Revelation and Jeremiah.—Ib., §20 (pp. 1031–2).

Bear in mind that many of the above formulas are not exclusively to be employed in cases of possession, but apply to all *maleficia* and are what the demonologists recommend, when combined with confession, fasting, and prayer, instead of seeking to combat sorcery with sorcery.

D'ALEXIS, LÉON [BÉRULLE, PIERRE DE].—*Traicté des Energumènes, suivy d'un Discours sur la possession de Marthe Brossier, contre les calomnies d'un Médecin de Paris.* Troyes, 1599.[1]

The devil is a vagabond on the face of the earth without other occupation than associating with man, the only being

[1] Bérulle later became a Cardinal. This tract was republished under his name (Paris, 1631) and in his works (1644). See Yve-Plessis, Nos. 604 and 637.

with which he can communicate. As he hates God and cannot attack him, he turns upon God's image and makes him the object of his hatred, all the more fiercely because envy incites him to strike down him whom he sees elevated to that glory which he has lost.—Ib., fol. 19–20.

Man is the sole object of his occupation and he torments him in every way that a merciless spirit can invent and human nature can suffer.—Ib., fol. 20.

It is not for man to understand the profound wisdom of God, who permits the devil thus to persecute his creatures.—Ib., fol. 24.

Quotes Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian and Arnobius, who all point to the casting out of devils by Christians as a proof of the truth of Christianity and then he proceeds with Sulpicius Severus, Jerome, Ambrose, St. Bernard, etc., to show the constant occurrence of possession and the power of the Church in exorcism.—Ib., fol. 31–3.

Since the Incarnation, God permits this more readily and Satan is more inclined to it, as many are saved whom he would otherwise be able to torment in hell.—Ib., fol. 37.

And, as Satan is the ape of God, it gives him special pleasure to incarnate himself in men as Christ did in humanity and this accounts for the great increase of possession since the birth of Christ.—Ib., fol. 38–9.

The torment of possession is the greatest that man can suffer—the longest, for the demon never tires; the least understood, for the cause is invisible; the most dangerous, for it leads to the irreparable ruin of soul and body.—Ib., fol. 41.

Exorcism is an act of jurisdiction executed on the demon.—Ib., fol. 46.

Liability to possession arises sometimes from original sin not wholly effaced by baptism and sometimes from sins—great or small. He quotes instances of the latter from Tertullian, Cassianus and Sulpicius Severus, showing it to be an ancient belief.—Ib., fol. 63–4.

According to Jerome, sucking children of two or three years old are possessed by the demon through the inscrutable judgment of God.—Ib., fol. 66.

The notion that sorcerers could send demons to possess persons is not a modern one. A canon in Ivo (Decretum, P. XI, c. 53) classes those "qui per invocationem daemonum mentes hominum perturbant" with *malefici*, *incantatores*, etc., as subject to anathema.—Ib., fol. 69.

Jerome (in his Vita Hilarionis) gives two cases in which demons were thus sent by magicians. In one of them the demon, when tormented by exorcisms, complained that he could not go out until the charm was removed—consisting of a brass plate inscribed with figures and buried under the threshold.—Ib., fol. 70.

To escape the interference of the Church, which can eject him, the demon sometimes conceals his possession of the patient, as in the case of a man of rank in whom for months he assumed the form of epilepsy—and anciently he adopted the mask of lunacy.—Ib., fol. 82.

Thus all diseases may be in reality only disguised forms of possession.

Eynatten, Maximilian van.—*Manuale Exorcismorum.* Antverpiae, 1648.

The author was canon and scholasticus of Antwerp. His work seems to have been first published in Antwerp in 1619. Grässe gives no other edition, but it is contained in the Thesaurus Exorcismorum of 1626 and my impression is that it was largely used for a century or more.[1] The general tone and moderation of the work is a decided improvement on its predecessors.

Besides strenuous exhortations as to piety, humility, prayer, and fasting as the best weapons of the exorcist in his contests with the demon, van Eynatten adds a special caution not rashly to assume that any one is possessed or bewitched, but carefully to weigh all indications and circumstances. Much less must he at once attribute to incantations and sorcery disease in men and cattle, however unusual or unknown, or losses occurring to harvests or other property, nor must he confirm the afflicted who think so or leave them under that opinion, or impute it or allow it to be imputed to the neighbors of the afflicted or to other persons known or unknown, but he must remove all evil suspicion or opinion from their minds, so as to avert quarrels, enmities, hatreds and worse things.—Ib., P. I, instructio 1 (pp. 4–5).

Before deciding he should obtain the opinions of experienced theologians and physicians.—Ib., instr. 2 (p. 5).

Demons sometimes enter the possessed in the shape of a wind or of a mouse or other small animal; sometimes there is a feeling of ice-cold water poured down the back, or that something runs over the body from head to foot.—Ib., p. 7.

[1] There is an edition of Antwerp, 1626, from the Plantin press, which seems only a reprint of that of 1619. The approbation of the 1648 ed. is dated June 23, 1618.

In repeating the instruction not to pronounce any disease a sorcery without medical consultation, he adds: "Verum quia experientia docet plerosque medicos fere omnia mala et accidentia hominibus obvenientia attribuere noxiis dispositionibus corporum et rarissime judicare aliquem veneficio diabolico infectum, exorcista non semper ita absolute stabit judicio medici"—but shall prudently judge for himself from the indications and circumstances, consulting in the graver cases skilled theologians.—Ib., instr. 3 (p. 14).

Then a long list of symptoms indicating sorcery, some of which are that the disease comes on suddenly, and not gradually as natural ones do; the patient's eyes are pinched; the skin, especially of the face, is yellow or ashen; the humors are dried up and there is extraordinary emaciation, all the members seem to be tied or constricted, especially the heart and mouth; there seems to be a lump at the orifice of the stomach or one passing up and down the throat; needle-pricks are felt in the heart and other places; sometimes the heart is as if corroded, or the kidneys are lacerated, or there are convulsions and epileptic seizures; they often are scarce able to look a priest in the face and the whites of the eyes are changed in various ways.—Ib., pp. 14–16.

It is not necessary that all these should be present, but it suffices for moral certainty or great probability if some of them, according to the nature of the case, concur, especially if the physicians, without pronouncing it absolutely to be sorcery, doubt and hesitate, vary in the remedies applied, and these are of no service. But, however certain the exorcist may be, he should not interfere with the medical treatment, except that it is well that the remedies should be blessed by a priest before taking.—Ib., pp. 17–19.

Among the questions to be asked of the demons in the possessed is "si sint ibidem ex aliquo pacto vel maleficio; si aliquod signum maleficii vel pacti sit datum vel alibi positum."—Ib., instr. 4 (p. 21).

Observe that nothing is said as to who is the sorcerer.—Of course not, as he expressly forbids casting suspicion on any one and the devil is a notorious liar.

Exorcism of the possessed should always be in a church or other sacred edifice, and never in a private house unless absolutely necessary. There should be no curious spectators, especially women and children, but there must always be

witnesses, preferably priests or religious, who can aid with their prayers.—Ib., instr. 5 (p. 22).

The exorcizer should watch lest the afflicted have recourse to impostors—soothsayers, *magi*, and such impious men—and must not permit them to give faith to such as may force themselves in, nor allow them readily to ascribe their ills to neighbors or persons known or unknown.—Ib., instr. 6 (p. 24).

From of old it has been permitted to the afflicted to carry amulets such as the Symbol of the Apostles, the beginning of St. John's Gospel, parts of psalms and the like, but there must be nothing of superstition connected with them; potency must not be ascribed to the figure or mode of writing, and the intention of the wearer must be to direct all his hope to God.—Ib., p. 30.

Sorcery must not be removed by sorcery, even if the witch who wrought it, or another, spontaneously offers herself. But it is lawful for the bewitched or for those in charge of him to remove and destroy the *signa maleficii*—not only if they are accidentally found, but also to search for them and even to ask the witch where they are hidden and induce or force her to show or remove them, "modo moraliter certi sint quod non utetur alio maleficio vel aliqua alia superstitione." —Ib., p. 32.

Observe that there is here no hair-splitting casuistry or probabilism.

Then follows excellent moral and pious advice for the exorcist and for him to instil into the energumen or bewitched.—Ib., Instr. 7 (pp. 33–6).

Demons leave the energumen sometimes by the mouth in the shape of a flame of fire or of a wind, or as bees or ants. Sometimes they depart through the ears, and the patient feels their departure from the stomach, the heart, and other parts. Sometimes it is *per secessum*, in the shape of a ball of hair. They even go out through the nose as drops of blood, and there are other modes and shapes which the prudent exorcist will easily recognize.—Ib., instr. 9 (pp. 40–1).

This ends the General Instructions. Part II (pp. 42–220) consists of exorcisms for the obsessed and directions from the Roman Ritual, the Pastorale Mechliniense, and approved authors. In it there is nothing about suffumigations or of ugly pictures of the demon to be burnt.

Part III contains " modum et praxim exorcizandi et curandi spiritualiter omne genus maleficiorum seu incantationum quibus homines in propriis corporibus et aliis bonis externis

a malis spiritibus vel maleficis ope daemonum affliguntur" (P. III, p. 221).

The bewitched, if possible, is to be brought to the church in the morning; he confesses and takes communion and then kneels before the altar. If too sick to be taken there, it can be done in the house, before a crucifix or image of the Virgin, the patient holding a lighted blessed candle—or it is placed beside him.—Ib., pp. 221–2.

The exorcism itself is a formidable ceremony. It begins with a prayer, then a long litany of the saints with numerous responses, then a long prayer with five responses, followed by readings from the Gospels and Psalms. Finally comes the exorcism itself. "Exorcizo te, N. corpore infirmum," in the name of God, "ut effugiat et discedat a te omnis phantasia, nequitia ac versutia diabolicae fraudis, omnisque spiritus immundus, adjuratus per eum qui venturus est judicare viros et mortuos et saeculum per ignem. Et tu maledicte satana, quisquis huic famulo Dei N. per quoscumque vel quomodocumque laesionis aliquid intulisti, recognosce sententiam tuam." "Depart with all thy noxious and accursed works and attempts from this servant of God, nor presume longer to injure him and his property." It concludes with sprinkling him with holy water.—Ib., pp. 222–9.

"Remedia spiritualia pro impeditis per maleficia, ope daemonum, in matrimonio." The *maleficium ligaturae* commonly occurs through defect in faith, hope, and charity towards God, for God thus punishes the incredulity and lack of trust of men. Pastors should therefore warn married folk and those about to be married that there is nothing to fear from these ligatures and *maleficia*, but that firm faith should be had in the sacrament [of marriage]. Therefore pastors and their deputies must be careful not, out of fear of ligatures, to solemnize marriages in any form not approved by the Ordinary, and thus seem to share this vile and damnable fear, when they should, by word and example, relieve others from such vain fears. But it is not unlawful, and may sometimes be permitted, to celebrate in a secret part of the church the marriage of those who desire to keep in ignorance those from whom they dread the *maleficium*.—Ib., pp. 251–2.

The priest should persuade married folk who, by the permission of God, "hujusmodi maleficio sunt innodati" to frequently confess and commune, and follow the example of Sara and Tobias by refraining for some days from intercourse,

preparing themselves by fasting and prayer and almsgiving. Meanwhile they should present themselves sometimes to the priest to be exorcised. Then follows a long formula of prayer, Scripture readings, and exorcism.—Ib., pp. 252–61.

If necessary this should be frequently repeated. The spouses should hear mass daily, frequently take communion, have masses celebrated for themselves, perform pilgrimages, carry Agnus Dei and relics. Their bed should be sprinkled nightly with holy water and adorned with blessed palms. Especially should they avoid the practice in some places of mutually renouncing their marriage and then having it celebrated again by a priest. Finally it is well to consult physicians and see if there is any physical impediment.—Ib., pp. 261–2.

"Remedia spiritualia contra Succubos et Incubos." "Daemones incubos et succubos hominibus infestos ex D. Augustino libro 15 de Civ. Dei, cap. 23, et aliis patribus cognoscimus." Still faith is not to be easily accorded to all cases, especially with the female sex, susceptible to imaginary wonders. Therefore the exorcist or pastor should examine these cases prudently with expert theologians and physicians, and, if it appears that one is vexed unwillingly, he can use the exorcisms provided for disease or for possession, for this is in some sort an obsession. The sufferer should follow the course prescribed above for those ligatured. The prudent exorcist will also consider whether this affliction is not instigated by God sometimes on women too greatly addicted to vain adornment of themselves in the endeavor to allure men to their love.—Ib., pp. 262–3.

"Modus exorcizandi circa quaevis animalia per maleficia et veneficia afflicta." The exorcist should first examine whether the sickness arises from natural causes, as from swallowing spiders in the food, the bites of venomous insects, the sucking of cows by toads and snakes which are apt to injure the teats, or the foul air of filthy stables. The first step in cure is to exhort the father and mother of the family and their servants to place themselves in a state of grace by repentance and confession and amended lives. In gathering fodder for the beasts one should not practice vain superstitions, but should recite the Paternoster, the Angelical Salutation, or the Credo. The formulae of exorcisms and benedictions are given from the Pontifical and Missal. Reckless persons excogitate others, but none should be used save those

received by the Church, not only to avoid superstitions but because there is more efficacy in our prayers when conjoined with those of the Church. After giving these instructions, on going to the stables the first care of the exorcist should be to examine whether there are *maleficii signa* under the threshold or buried in the ground, and, if found, to remove them. This has had the happiest results to some who have dug out to some depth all the earth of the stable.—Ib., pp. 264–8.

Among the exorcisms which follow is, "Exorcismus contra invisibilem lactis, butyri, vel aliarum rerum per incantationes ablationem."—Ib., p. 282.

As a precaution against such things he urges those busied with the milk, not only to recite prayers and cross themselves, but to light a blessed candle and sprinkle holy water and blessed salt.—Ib., p. 284.

Apparently insect pests were included in the evils wrought by *maleficium*, and were to be removed by such an exorcism as this—"Adjuro vos, daemones, per Deum Patrem omnipotentem . . . ut statim ab his agris, campis, vineis, pratis, hortis, aquis, omne quod noxium est amoveatis. Adjuro etiam vos animalia et quaecunque per maleficium diaboli noxia estis hominibus et bonis eorum, per Deum Patrem omnipotentem, et per Filium ejus, et per Spiritum sanctum Paraclitum, ut hinc discedatis, et nocere desinatis graminibus, frugibus, piscibus, etc., et dissipemini, et omnis virtus et potestas nocendi vobis adimatur, et interimat vos dextera Dei omnipotentis," etc.—Ib., pp. 304–5.

The disturbances in houses frequently caused by witches are to be met with this exorcism—"Adjuro te, serpens antique, per Judicem vivorum et mortuorum, per Factorem mundi, qui habet potestatem mittere te in gehennam, ut ab hac domo festinus discedas. Ipse tibi imperat, maledicte diabole, qui ventis ac mari et tempestatibus imperavit. Ipse tibi imperat, qui te de supernis caelorum in inferiora terrae demergi praecipit. Ipse tibi imperat, qui te retrorsum abire praecepit. Audi ergo, Satana, et time, et victus et prostratus recede, adjuratus in nomine Domini nostri Jesu Christi."—Ib., pp. 312–13.

All these exorcisms and adjurations of course are accompanied with long prayers and extracts from Scripture, rendering the ceremony impressive, if not to Satan, at least to awestruck bystanders. Those for the last one occupy nearly 8 pages. The demand for the expulsion of *Poltergeister* must have been frequent, as there are three other forms of exorcism given and an "Exprobatio" (ib., pp. 335–6).

As it is advisable that all which is used by the possessed or bewitched should be exorcized or blessed, formulas are furnished for the purpose, drawn from the Pontifical, Missal, and Roman Ritual, excluding "formularia a temerariis quibusdam, multis superstitionibus admixtis." Then follow formulas for salt, bread, water, meat, eggs, fruit, and comestibles in general, wine, beer, and other drinks, oil, medicines, the bed, the bed-chamber, the fire in which to burn *signa maleficia*, incense.—Ib., pp. 337–54.

E. WITCHCRAFT BY REGIONS.

I. Spain and Portugal.

[It was in Italy and Spain, as Mr. Lea has indicated in the chapters on sorcery and witchcraft in his histories of the Inquisition, that the theologians and jurists of the Inquisition perfected the theory of witchcraft; and it was there that the great witch prosecutions began. But it was also in Italy and Spain, and by the theologians and jurists of the Inquisition, as Mr. Lea likewise pointed out in his *Inquisition of Spain*, IV, p. 246, that before the end of the 16th century the persecutions first found effective check through their rejection of testimony as to the attendants at the witch-sabbat. This is doubtless why, though retaining his notes on the Spanish theologians Alphonso de Spina, Ciruelo and Jofreu and the Portuguese Valle de Moura, he had gathered no fresh material for Spain and almost none for Italy. It is probable that from those gathered for the chapters of his histories of the Inquisition he would have compiled for his History of Witchcraft a survey of its story in these lands. But it is unlikely that this would have differed essentially from what he had already published; and these materials, like those for all his published works, are accessible to scholars on the shelves of his library at the University of Pennsylvania.]

II. Italy.

A code for Piacenza, apparently of the late fourteenth century, has no provisions concerning sorcery. It is followed by decrees running to 1487 respecting all kinds of questions and crimes, in which similarly there is no allusion to it.—Statuta et Decreta antiqua Civitatis Placentiae (Brixiae, 1560).

In a compilation of Milanese decrees which seem to be of the fourteenth century, printed in 1594 as for current use, there is a brief chapter with the heading "Quod Venefici incantatores capite puniantur." It consists simply of: "Venefici capite puniantur, ita quod moriantur. Malefici arbitrio Potestatis puniantur, in persona vel in avere, inspecta qualitate facti et personae."—Statuta Criminalia Mediolani e tenebris in lucem edita (Bergomi, 1594), fol. 11.

These evidently refer to sorcery, as this chapter is one of a long series prescribing the penalties for all kinds of crimes specifically.

It is rather singular that in a decree of 1393 by Gian Galeazzo Visconti, confirmed by one of Filippo Maria Visconti in 1446, prescribing the punishments for various crimes at Milan, sorcery is not specified; for this cannot be held to be meant in the list of "homicidia, maleficia, robariae, veneficia et alia detestabilia crimina."—Antiqua Ducum Mediolani Decreta (Mediolani, 1654), pp. 186, 315.

Possibly it was relegated to the spiritual courts, as we know the Inquisition was busy against witches in Como. The burnings, however, when the victims were relaxed, were peculiarly horrible.

The former of these decrees specifies that death by burning is to be performed by chaining the culprit to an iron ring which revolves around a column, so that he can travel around it at the length of the chain "ut mortem dolentiorem sustineat, ibidem tamen dicto modo comburatur taliter quod moriatur." —Ib., p. 186.

In a collection of Statutes of Milan from 1494 to 1743 I can find nothing relating to sorcery. Although the title would seem to restrict these to local regulations by the municipal authorities, there are many from the rulers such as Philip II. —Ang. Stef. Garonus, Ordines Senatus Mediolani ab anno 1490 usque ad annum 1743 (Mediolani, 1743).

I suppose these offences were regarded as pertaining to the spiritual jurisdiction.

The humanist Antonio Galateo (c. 1480), a native of South Italy, evidently disbelieved in the modern witchcraft, for, after describing what some people believed as to the Sabbat and other wonders, he adds "et nescio quae alia deliramenta." —De Situ Iapigiae, p. 126 (Cantù, Eretici d'Italia, II, p. 397).

[An execution at Rome in 1424 is thus described:] "E dopo a di 28. del detto mese [June, 1424], fù arsa Finicella Strega,

perche essa diabolicamente uccideva di molte persone, e ne affatturava di molte, e tutta Roma ci andò a vedere."—Infessura, Diarium (Muratori, Rer. It. SS., III, ii, 1123).[1]

The use of the word Strega would seem to indicate that witchcraft was already recognized in Rome—though the details are scanty.

This is probably the same case as that related by Andreas of Regensburg, who says that in Rome, in the time of Martin V, a cat killed a number of infants not carefully watched by their nurses, until a wise old man, watching a child, pretended not to observe a cat entering the window until it had reached the infant to suffocate it, when he wounded it with a sword. The traces of blood were followed and the cat was found to be an old woman under the charge of a neighboring surgeon, who changed herself to a cat when she pleased and prolonged her life by sucking infants' blood. "Quae vetula tanquam striga judicata igne est combusta."—Andrea Ratisponensis, Chronicon (Eccard, Corpus Hist. Medii Aevi, I, p. 2159).

The Fifth Lateran Council (1514) decrees that as sorceries by the invocation of demons, incantations, and superstitious divinations are prohibited by the civil and canon laws, all clerics found guilty of these shall be marked with infamy at the discretion of their superiors; if they do not desist they shall be deposed and thrust into monasteries for a period to be defined by their superiors and deprived of their benefices and functions. Laity of either sex shall be subject to excommunication and the penalties of the civil and canon law. —Lib. v in Septimo, tit. xii, c. 5.

It is observable here that there is no reference to witchcraft—also that clerics are treated with marked leniency and that as regards laymen secular law is admitted, and that no allusion is made to the heresy usually assumed to be involved. The whole matter is taken out of the hands of the Inquisition.

Absolution by the papal penitentiary was cheap. "Pro muliere venefica vel incantatrice, postquam superstitiones abjuravit, in quolibet supradictorum casuum taxatur turon. 6, duc. 2."—A[ntoine] D[u] P[inet], Taxe des Parties casuelles des Papes (Lyon, 1564), p. 74.

The *supradicti casus* are infanticide, abortion, parricide and homicide in general. Here the "turon." is evidently the *gros tournois*. Whether the ducats named are alternative, so as to give two currencies, or cumulative,

[1] But see also Tommasini's better documented ed. in the *Fonti per la Storia d'Italia* (Rome 1890).

I can scarce determine. Usually the ducats are one-quarter of the turon., *e. g.*, 50 turon. 12 duc. 6 carl, but not always, as it should be if the object was to state the same price in both currencies.

The early taxes of 1338 have nothing as to sorcery.—Denifle, Die älteste Taxrolle der Apost. Pönitentiarie (*Archiv für Litteratur- und Kirchengeschichte*, IV, p. 221).

The facility with which accusations of witchcraft were brought, and the tendency to vent spite by bringing them, are evidenced in some lines written in 1523 abusing the poor old pope Adrian VI, who alienated the corrupt by his attempts at reform and the righteous by his failure to accomplish anything:

> "Perfido come il mare Adriano,
> Ipocrito, crudel, invido, avaro,
> Odioso ad ciascun, a nesun charo,
> Incantator, mago, idolatra, vano,
> Rustico, inexorabil, inhumano,
> Falsario, traditor, ladro, beccaro,
> Solitario, bestial et fatuchiaro."—
> Pastor, Geschichte der Päpste, IV, ii, p. 153.

About the year 1360 the Legate Cardinal Albornoz framed a code of laws for the papal territories, which with additions was confirmed by Sixtus IV, by Leo X in the Lateran Council of 1512, and by Paul III in 1538 and 1544. In this sorcery is not alluded to among the crimes for which punishments are provided, but there is a severe arraignment of inquisitors who through avarice oppress the people. They are told not to defame the innocent through malice or ignorance and to confine themselves strictly to the suppression of heresy, under pain of excommunication.—Aegidianae Constitutiones cum Additionibus Carpensibus, lib. iii, c. 29 (Venetiis, 1588), p. 184.

In the Statutes of Rome, compiled by Sixtus IV with additions by Alexander VI, sorcery is not enumerated among the crimes for which trial by inquisition can be had.—Statuta et Novae Reformationes Urbis Romae (Romae, 1521), lib. ii, c. 5, fol. 3.

Nor among those for which torture can be used.—Ib., c. 13, fol. 5.

In the 149 chapters of this lib. ii, there is a minute and elaborate enumeration of crimes and their penalties, but there is no allusion to sorcery. That blasphemy is included (c. 102) would seem to show that there was a tendency to trench on

spiritual jurisdiction. This blasphemy is, "Quicunque male dixerit deo vel beate Marie virginis" (sic)—which certainly savors of heresy.

Lib. iii has some scattering provisions as to crimes, but no allusions to sorcery.

Lib. iv consists of additions by Alexander VI in 1494. It defines many crimes, but has no allusion to sorcery.

In a compilation of criminal law for the Aemilian Legation at the commencement of the eighteenth century there is no allusion of any kind to sorcery. A very detailed Bando Generale of Cardinal Ottoboni, in 1690, specifies the punishment for all descriptions of crimes, from homicide to wearing masks and shooting tame pigeons, but has no reference to sorcery, heretical or otherwise.—Constitutiones, Edicta, etc. Legationis Aemiliae (Forolivii, 1702), pp. 153–84.

Aeneas Sylvius, later Pope Pius II, writes that a great astronomer who is physician to the Duke of Saxony asks him if he knows of a Veneris Mons in Italy where magic arts are cultivated. He replies that he does not, but he has heard that near Norcia (Umbria) there is a lake where an overhanging mountain makes a large cavern "Illic memini audisse me striges esse et daemones ac nocturnas umbras, ubi qui audaces animo sunt spiritus vident alloquunturque et artes ediscunt magicas."—Aeneas Sylvius, Epistt., lib. i, Ep. 45 (Opera, Basileae, 1571, pp. 531–2).

The letter is without date, but probably written between 1440 and 1450. It shows that "striges" were already a topic and that there was already talk of the Venusberg.

In papal Benevento, the Inquisitor, Fra Barnaba Capograsso, burns three women for witchcraft in 1506.—Amabile, Il Santo Officio in Napoli, I, p. 97 (q. v.).

See *Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies*, pp. 55–6.

Weyer, writing about 1566, praises the moderation of the Bolognese judges towards "maleficas utriusque sexus, quorum damnatae incantationes generi humano vel vitae bestiarum minus nocuissent (quos muliebri in sexu, lingua vulgari *le strige* Itali appellant)." They are led, stripped to the waist, from the old palace, placed backwards on asses with hands tied to the tails, and marched through the streets, with mitres painted with terrifying demons stirring the infernal fires, while an executioner scourges them with rods smartly on back and breast. When they reach the Dominican con-

vent they are taken to an upper chamber with a balcony enclosed with iron rods, looking over the cemetery, said to have been arranged for heretics by the friars of the convent who were inquisitors. There, with a casque on the head, the culprit is placed in a wheeled chair and thrice run out on the balcony for fifteen minutes each time and exposed to the clamor of the crowd, who shower stones at them, which are intercepted by the iron bars.—Weyer, De Praestigiis Daemonum, l. vi, c. 21 (Amstelodami, 1660), p. 523.

III. Central Europe.

[As for Central Europe, where cruelty towards those accused of witchcraft reached its height, Mr. Lea agreed fully with those European scholars who have given it most careful study that, like the superstitions on which the fear of witches fed, the harsh procedure against them had its rise in the Alpine regions. This was the scene of the activity of the German inquisitors who won from Innocent VIII the bull that adopted their wildest charges against these tools of Satan and that enlisted against them prince as well as prelate. Their handbook, the Witch-Hammer, was effective in persuading the hesitant Northerners to transfer to the harsher secular courts the witch-trials of these trans-Alpine lands; and it was in Tyrol and southern Swabia that these inquisitors put first into practice their own rules and sowed the seeds of the epidemic witch-craze. Its course through Swabia, Bavaria, Franconia, the Rhinelands and onward is followed in these notes on Central Europe. The modern books here dealt with represent, of course, only a gleaning. The most important material for regional history is in the contemporary writers already exploited, whose evidence these modern students have attempted to knit together. First of all, under "General Accounts," will be found a group who have attempted a broader view than a regional and whose statistics of trials and executions seemed needed because Mr. Lea had not yet culled for himself more comprehensive works, such as Soldan-Heppe's or Roskoff's.]

General Accounts.

Wächter, O.[1]—*Vehmgerichte und Hexenprozesse in Deutschland.* Stuttgart, 1882.

[1] This writer must not be confused with his more eminent father, the jurist Karl Georg von Wächter (1797–1880). This booklet, written for the popular series of Spemann, though it claims to use "the sources," does not cite them; and, though it seems drawn from standard works, its figures must be taken with caution.—B.

Quedlinburg (Saxony), 1589, 133 witches burnt in one day. Elbing (West Prussia), 65 in eight months of 1590. Lindheim, with a population of 540, burnt 30 between 1640 and 1651. The little town of Büdingen (Hesse) in 1633 burnt 64 and in 1634, 50 (p. 180). The little town of Dieburg (Hesse) in 1627, 36 (p. 181). Neisse (Silesia), 1651, 42 women and girls, and in the Principality of Neisse, in nine years, over 1000, among whom were children of two to four years old. Offenburg (Breisgau), 1627–30, 60. Ellingen (Franconia), in 1590, 65 in eight months (p. 181). In Trier, under Bishop Johann, in 1585, there were left only two persons alive in two villages and in 22 villages in the neighborhood of Trier there were 368 put to death from 1587 to 1593 (p. 188). In Zuckmantel (Silesia), belonging to the Bishop of Breslau, as early as 1551 there were eight executioners employed (p. 188). In the Mainz Electorate a comprehensive persecution commenced early in the seventeenth century, especially in Dieburg, Seligenstadt and Aschaffenburg. In 1627, in Dieburg, 85 were executed and whole families were exterminated; in Grosskrotzenburg and Bürgel, about 300 (pp. 192–3). In Fulda the self-styled "Malefizmeister," Balzer Voss,[1] boasted that he had caused the execution of over 700 of both sexes and hoped to bring the number up to 1000; he was excessively savage in his tortures and many died under his hand or immediately after. He invented new and severer tortures. He was paid by the head, and in three years he thus earned 5393 gulden (pp. 198–9). In Nassau the persecution was in full force after 1628; committees were formed in all the villages and commissioners were sent around to hunt up witches; the prisons were soon filled and torture brought ample confessions; so great was the excitement that many came forward and denounced themselves. In Dillenburg there were 35 executions, in Driedorf 30, and in Herborn 90 (p. 200). In Württemberg, at Rottweil there were 42 in the sixteenth and 71 in the seventeenth centuries; in Esslingen a fearful prosecution began in 1662 (p. 203).

In the *Berliner Monatschrift* of 1784, Stadtsyndikus Voigt of Quedlinburg reckons the number of witches excuted in Europe at about a million. Other estimates reach several millions[2] (p. 205).

[1] Not Voss, but Balthasar Ross, was the name of this wandering witch-judge according to such later writers as Janssen-Pastor (ed. of 1903) and Bauer (1911), the reviser of Soldan-Heppe. The "700" of his boast included victims earlier than those of Fulda, where in his fury of 1603–5 only 205 perished.—B.

[2] These are merely guesses.

Holzinger, J. B.—*Zur Naturgeschichte der Hexen.*[1] Graz, 1883.

In Styria, according to numerous existing documents, executions were in masses. The Feldbach *Hexenprocess* indicates a score of executions in 1672–4. The protocol of Schloss Gleichenberg says that, in 1689–90, 39 were burnt in what is still known as the Hexenställe between Gleichenberg and Trautmannsdorf. Abraham a Sancta Clara (Ulrich Megerle), who was then living here, writes that Steiermark suffered incredible damage from witches, of which a great book might be composed, only from 1685 to the present year 1688.—Ib., pp. 6–7.

Dr. Ludwig Mejer, in his *Die Periode der Hexenprocesse* (Hannover, 1882), asserts that witches intoxicated themselves with a decoction of stramonium, causing visions and dreams so impressive that when sober they believed them to be real. From early times old women brewed a drink from henbane to cause forgetfulness of hunger and grief. Just at the time when scholasticism evolved the idea of intercourse with demons (it was as old as Augustin and proved by Aquinas) the gypsies first appeared in Europe—about 1420—and brought with them from the East the stramonium, which spread rapidly, due to its power to give enjoyment.—Ib., pp. 10–11.

It is not worth while to give more of this folly.

Holzinger proceeds with extracts from processes to show that witches smeared themselves with ointments; also in one or two cases they mentioned drinking something which perverted their senses.—Ib., pp. 12–13.

Holzinger, on examination of the earliest German books on plants, finds that *Datura Stramonium* first appears in 1592, when Caspar Ratzenberger says he grew it from seed in 1584. Another authority says in 1605 that the seed was first brought to Vienna in 1583. It was cultivated as a garden flower. A kindred species, *Datura Metel*, first appears in 1543 as a garden flower. Is still a garden flower late in seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries.—Ib., pp. 20–2.

In the Landgerichts-Ordnung, December 30, 1656, of Ferdinand III, among the proofs justifying arrest is the finding of oil, ointment, hurtful powders, *Püchsen*, pots with vermin

[1] The purpose of this presidential address by Holzinger, who was a naturalist as well as a Styrian jurist, was to refute the newly published theory of Mejer as to the witches' use of henbane to beget the sensation of flying.

and human bones. The Halsgerichts-Ordnung of Joseph I, July 16, 1707, is conceived in the full spirit of the Malleus, and it remained in force in Austria until the Theresiana of 1769, which limited the prosecutions. It was not until Joseph II's "Allgemeine Gesetz über Verbrechen," January 13, 1787, that the witch laws were abolished.—Ib., p. 14.

Gives the recipes for the ointment of Weyer, Cardan, etc. Among many inert things, powerful drugs are enumerated—aconite, nightshade (solanum), *hyosciamus* (henbane), belladonna (atropa), etc.—Ib., pp. 14–15. (What reliance is to be placed on these recipes is doubtful. Compare Macbeth, Act iv, Scene 1.—H. C. L.)

Treats of these plants at length. In considering stramonium he says that the witch-processes and the flight to the Sabbat commenced about 1450(!).—Ib., p. 19.

It must be conceded as most probable that in many cases the narcotic effect of plants caused pleasurable hallucinations and ecstasies—but it must be borne in mind that often the witch is described as anointing, not herself, but her staff, fork, shovel, etc., so that finally one may regard the anointing as a symbolic act. That the belief in the magic power of the act was existent is shown in the custom of anointing a weapon that had caused a wound.—Ib., pp. 28–9.

But there were other causes. Witchcraft could never have filled the world with horrors had not the Church lent it her full authority by teaching the personal existence and power of the devil and mingling sorcerers with heretics in the persecutions of the Inquisition in her efforts to obtain universal power. The civil magistracy felt itself only the instrument of the spiritual jurisdiction and under biblical prescription did not question the justice of capital punishment. Thus the specific type of witchcraft was developed by the procedure under which accusation was followed by execution and the popular belief was formed by countless so-called confessions.—Ib., pp. 30–1.

In Steiermark the use of the "Marterstuhl" was obligatory. Its severity is indicated in the case of Märina Scheppin, in 1695, at Lichtenegg, under the jurisdiction of the Dominicans of Pettau, who was placed on the *Stuhl* at 4 A.M., July 1, and after six and a half hours confessed to intercourse with the devil and was duly burnt. Apparently ingenuity was always at work to devise more efficient methods, for Leopold I issued October 8, 1679, a rescript forbidding the

use of a new and unheard-of form of excessive rigor known as the *Nagelbett* or bed of nails. In 1673, at Gutenhag, the Styrian judge Wolf von Lämpertitsch kept the fifty-seven-year-old Maria Wukinetz eleven days and nights on the *Stuhl*, burning her feet with what was called "Insletpflaster" because she would not confess to pact, until finally she died insane. To realize the frightful tortures in use, one must visit the *Folterkammer*, *e. g.*, that built-up at Nürnberg, and see the terrible implements assembled there as in an arsenal.—Ib., pp. 31–3.

The examination of the protocols shows, by the uniformity of the confessions in all places, that they were merely affirmative replies to questions framed in a stereotyped formula. It was only by such confession that the victim could obtain the comparative mercy of strangulation to escape the lingering death by burning.—Ib., p. 34.

Längin, Georg.—*Religion und Hexenprozess.* Leipzig, 1888.

The spread of witch-persecution in Germany in the second half of the sixteenth century is largely attributable to the Carolina. The confusion wrought by the infiltration of the Roman law into the customary law and the differing customs of the various provinces, together with the arbitrary practice as to both proofs and punishments, had become intolerable by the end of the fifteenth century and many attempts at reform had been made by the Reichstäge of 1498, 1500, 1517, 1518, 1521, 1524, 1529 and 1530. Always some of the powerful states objected to abandoning their customs, and it was not till 1532 that the Reichstag of Regensburg accepted the Carolina, and it was agreed to by most of the provinces. It was based on the criminal code of Bamberg, which had not long before been drafted by the Freiherr Johann von Schwarzenberg, an eminent jurist.—Ib., p. 81.

The Bamberg code was adopted in 1507, and in 1516 was introduced into the Frankish lands of Brandenburg. It condemned heresy to the stake and likewise any one who through sorcery should injure another. If no injury is done, he shall be punished according to circumstances.—Ib., p. 82.

This was a novelty (perhaps owing to the influence of the Hexenhammer—H. C. L.); for though similar passages are found in the Sachsenspiegel (see *Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, III, p. 432) and Schwabenspiegel, they had long fallen

into disuse. In the criminal ordinance of Maximilian I in 1499 [for Tyrol and Rudolfzell] there is no allusion to sorcery, and in the Polizeiordnung of Ferdinand I, in 1544 [for his Austrian lands], in spite of the Carolina, sorcery and divination are treated as deceptions to be punished as such.—Ib., p. 82.

The sources of this Bamberg code were the Bamberg Stadtrecht and the Nürnberg Recht.[1] Of these the former is silent as to sorcery; the latter prescribes the loss of part of the tongue and public exposure, tied to a post with a mitre on which the devil is painted.—Ib., pp. 82–3.

The Carolina held fast to the accusatorial process, requiring an accuser and witnesses, and forbade torture except when there was legal evidence.[2]—Ib., pp. 85–6.

Längin argues that the rapid development of witchcraft towards the end of the century was due to the Counter-Reformation, which, after 1570, not only checked the progress of Protestantism, but rapidly won back many of its conquests and organized a ruthless persecution of those who were scattered through Catholic lands. This was largely due to the Jesuits, who magnified the influence of the demon and connected sorcery with heresy.—Ib., pp. 109–12.

(Thus Del Rio points out that sorcery followed the outbreak of Lutheranism in North Germany; in Switzerland, where almost every woman is a witch, the Waldenses have maintained themselves. "Nihil per Angliam, Scotiam, Franciam, Belgium hanc pestem celerius et uberius propagavit quam dira Calvinismi lues." And he proceeds to quote from Dr. Jo. Maldonado, "quod daemones in haereticis, ut olim in idolis, habent domicilium; . . . quemadmodum famem pestilentia sequitur, ita haeresim varia curiosarum artium genera sequantur; . . . quod soleant daemones haereticis uti ad fallendos homines, quasi formosis meretricibus."—Del Rio, Disquis. Magic., Proloquium.)

In Catholic lands outrages on the Host were often included in the accusations, and in these cases tearing with hot pincers preceded the execution.—Ib., p. 117.

The Prince-Abbot of Fulda, Balthasar v. Dernbach, driven out by his Protestant subjects, returned in 1602. Within three years there were about 250 burnings. His minister in this was Balthasar Nuss [Ross], and it was accompanied with so much cruelty and oppression that, after his death in 1606,

[1] But much more largely the Italian jurists. See Brunnenmeister.
[2] This is much too strong. Cf. Güterbock and K. G. Wächter.

Nuss was thrown in prison and lay there till he was beheaded in 1618.—Ib., p. 118.

Towards the end of the fifteenth century there was active persecution in the territory of Mainz. Then it fell off, but after 1570 it became an organized witch-hunt which cast terror everywhere. The protocols do not give the names of the victims or the verdicts, for almost every trial ended in conviction. Under Archbishop Georg Friedrich v. Greiffenklau (1626–9) the records show 36 burnings in 1627. In November, 1629, a new prosecution of 21 persons was begun in Dieburg. In Grosskrotzenburg and Bürgel there were 300 executions and the archiepiscopal treasury gained thousands of acres. At length Johann Philipp v. Schönborn (1647–73), who had learned mercy from Spee, put an end to these multitudinous proceedings.—Ib., pp. 118–19.

Greed had much to do with the persecution. When the victims were wealthy there were the confiscations. Even when there were not, there were numerous officials, from judges to executioners, who made a handsome livelihood by their services, which were liberally rewarded, for the judges taxed the costs of the trials and the victims paid for their tortures. Then there were the meals which the officials enjoyed after each execution, when food and drink were lavishly supplied. Wealthy families, moreover, frequently paid to the judges and high officials regular stipends for protection and the assurance that none of their members should be arrested.—Ib., p. 125.

In Dieburg (Oberhessen) the account of the executioner in 1628 and 1629 amounted to 253 fl. 13½ batzen, including 43 executions at 3 fl. each and 23 "justified" through torture at 3 fl. In the prosecution of Keppler's mother the simple costs amounted to 80 fl. besides the advocate's fees. On her imprisonment two watchmen were assigned to her at heavy wages, and Keppler vainly endeavored to have them dispensed with. In Esslingen (Württemberg)[1] the great processes of 1662 and 1663 cost 2300 fl. The town council of Esslingen gave three tuns of wine to each of the priests who ministered to the culprits, with a warning not to interfere with the duties of the judges.—Ib., pp. 126–7.

To defray these costs the possessions, real and personal, of the accused were largely swept away. They were sold at low prices, mostly to those who divided the spoils, and the

[1] Esslingen was a free city.

proceeds found their way, under the pretext of costs, to the princely or episcopal fiscs.—Ib., p. 126.

In Zugmantel (Silesia) the burning of 11 witches in October, 1639, brought in 425 thalers (to the local authorities?) and the rest, amounting to 351 thalers, 23 groschen, went to the Prince-Bishop of Breslau, Karl Ferdinand v. Polen.—Ib., p. 127.

Martin Bucer (†1551), the Strassburg reformer, was one of the most influential opponents of the witch persecutions, and it is owing to him that in Strassburg, even in the seventeenth century, the punishment was mostly exile.[1]—Ib., p. 163.

Weyer's influence was shaken when the mind of William III, his protector, was disturbed by an apoplectic fit. In 1581 the duke gave assent to the torturing of an accused woman. From the Netherlands Alba forced Weyer's dismissal from court; he retired to his possessions in Cleves and died in 1588.—Ib., p. 164.

There were occasional burnings in the Protestant states during the sixteenth century. In Brandenburg there were witch-prosecutions in 1551, 1553, 1564; in Württemberg about 1562; in Baden-Durlach a witch was burnt in 1562 and another in 1570 and three in 1579. In Hesse, Philip the Magnanimous in 1526 forbade the use of torture in the cases of some women accused of witchcraft, and nothing more was heard there of witchcraft till the half-century had passed; but in 1564 a woman who confessed under torture was condemned to the stake.—Ib., pp. 180–1.

Philip's son, Wilhelm IV, was superior to the superstition of the time. About 1575 two women were accused of witchcraft. He referred the matter to the General Synod, then in session at Marburg. While it believed in witchcraft, after a discussion it pronounced the affair beyond its jurisdiction and returned it to the Landgraf, whereupon he issued a circular to all pastors to teach the people that sorcery could injure none who disbelieved in it, for the demon had no power but what man conceded to him.—Ib., p. 182.

In 1582 the case of a woman in Darmstadt, who had wrought injuries by sorcery, was brought before the same synod, when it decided that when a Christian despised the devil and sorcery, the devil loses; when one dreads and fears the black arts, the devil wins; and it ordered the people to be taught that all that happens to them is not to be ascribed to

[1] This is an error. See Bucer's own words as printed by Schweblin.

sorcery, for much is sent by God or happens naturally, and no one can be injured by sorcery further than God permits; repentance, prayer and other Christian means are to be employed, and the defamation of innocent persons be wholly avoided.—Ib., p. 183.

All this shows how little influence the Carolina had, at least in the Protestant provinces.

But in the last quarter of the sixteenth century the Protestant lands yielded to the tendencies of the times and cast aside the old discretion, displaying in some places the grossest cruelty. This was especially the case with Saxony, the leader. It had never accepted the Carolina and, in 1572, the Elector August (brother and successor of Moritz) issued a new criminal code, which in some respects was severer than the Carolina. This was the case with sorcery. All pact with the demon was punished with fire, even if no injuries were wrought. Injuries, great or small, caused by sorcery without pact were visited with beheading. This was a practical answer to Weyer, who was quoted and refuted with the authority of Grillandus.—Ib., pp. 184–6.

In 1585 two women executed as witches in Dresden.—Ib., p. 232.

The Elector August was a hard and violent man, given to alchemy and divination, besides being earnestly fanatical in his religion.—Ib., pp. 186–7.

Another leading cause of the new Protestant tendency was the perversity of the theologians, manifested in the so-called *Concordiensformel* of 1580, in which the Lutheran doctrines as developed by them were defined, and curses and anathemas showered on all who would not accept them. It erected a barrier to the further progress of the Reformation and cost a large portion of the territories already won. Enforced by Württemberg and Saxony and rejected by most of the other Protestant princes, it divided them into two camps, as fiercely opposed to each other as to the Holy See, it gave to the Jesuits the opportunity of winning back much that Rome had lost, and was the remote cause of the Thirty Years' War. Moreover, it put an end to the spirit of free inquiry and individual judgment in which the Reformation originated and to which it owed its development. Religious teaching no longer concerned itself with the spirit of Christianity, but was either a polemic against the opposite party or a dry

exposition of the new scholastic theology in which the devil figured largely, while the ardor of persecution was a lesson in inhumanity admirably fitted to train the people to apply the same principles to witchcraft.—Ib., pp. 187–97.

In all this there grew the belief in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, every word of which was God's own utterance.—Ib., pp. 197–99.

The Old Testament came to be regarded as embodying laws dictated by God and still binding on lawgivers and law-dispensers, so that it became an imprescriptible duty to God to exterminate the objects of ancient Hebrew superstition.—Ib., pp. 200–1.

Under this ruling tendency everything was subordinated to theology—not only religion, but law, philosophy, statesmanship and morals—throughout the seventeenth century, and its climax is found in Benedict Carpzov's *Practica nova rerum criminalium*, which appeared in 1635 and was reprinted nine times until 1723. It was the leading authority, as he was the recognized greatest jurist of his time, to whose court at Leipzig were submitted questions from all quarters. During his long career, up to 1666, he is reputed to have signed 20,000 death sentences. The character of his training may be estimated from his boast that he had read the Bible through fifty-three times, and his book may be regarded as the *Malleus Maleficarum* of Protestantism. In it he always has a biblical text to justify any conclusion reached, whether the inquisitorial process with torture, the death penalty for adultery, bigamy, heresy, blasphemy, coining, theft, or the most ferocious death-penalties with added hot pincers, cutting-off of arms, the wheel and the stake.—Ib., pp. 202–3.

Längin follows with a number of examples, taken from Carpzov's book, which show how thoroughly Lutheranism was interpenetrated with the spirit of the Inquisition.—Ib., pp. 207–9.

On witchcraft Carpzov's chief authorities are Grillandus, Remy, Binsfeld, Del Rio, Bodin, James I and the *Malleus Maleficarum*.—Ib., p. 211.

Carpzov fully accepts the theory of implicit pact and all the stories of renouncing God and worshipping the devil, through whom they work evil to man and beast. Also the witch-mark. It is the *crimen sceleratissimum et nefandissimum* and those who undertake to protect witches are inspired by the devil and entangled in his nets. He is very severe on

Weyer, for the existence of witches is proved by Holy Writ.—Längin, pp. 211–12.

Carpzov accepts all the evil powers and deeds ascribed to witches by the Malleus, including incubi and succubi. It is not absurd that witches fly through the air to the devilish gatherings and are personally present there. They have frequently borne witness that in Lorraine there are 800 of such assemblies and this is confirmed by judgments sent to the Leipzig court. Even though there may often be illusion, they none the less deserve death, for they at least have the will to do it.—Längin, pp. 213–14.

He admits that the Carolina only commands death by fire when evil is wrought, but against this is the law of the Elector August, which prescribes it for all kinds of sorcery.—Ib., pp. 214–15.

It is suggestive that in 1569 Siegmund Feyerabend, in Frankfurt-am-Main, published his well-known *Theatrum diabolorum.* In the preface the Christian is called upon to consider the unchristian security of almost all men in scarce believing that there is a devil or that he is so evil and urges us to our destruction. The book consists of twenty sermons or essays on the devil, to whom in the first tract all the evil and misfortune on earth are attributed. He uses wicked men as his instruments. The number of demons is estimated at more than twenty-six billions. Witch flight and transformation into cats, etc., are illusions of the devil. People think that witches through pact with the devil do all wicked things—bring storms, destroy harvests, cause sickness; but in this the devil befools them. We hold that he does these things and that witches through natural poisons injure men and beasts. So much is attributed to poor women that they fancy that they do what is impossible. The Sabbat is imaginary, and Luther rightly says that it is not only forbidden to do it, but even to believe it. Sexual intercourse [with demons] is a delusion and so is change into beasts.—Ib., pp. 217–21.

The fifth tract, however, says that sorcerers, with aid of the devil, can injure cattle and steal milk. He holds assemblies of witches and, when God permits, he carries them through the air, but (also) he throws them into deep sleep and makes them imagine it. With the *Malleus Maleficarum* he holds that they are in pact with the devil and he concedes sexual intercourse. It is a delusion that witches steal and eat children. The devil can carry off children and replace them

with himself or others in the form of children and charm the eyes of parents so that they do not recognize their children. With Moses he desires that diviners, witches and sorcerers be put to death.—Ib., p. 223.

Evidently the authors of the tracts are not all of the same mind. The remaining tracts are mostly devoted to presenting the devil in his different aspects as the embodiment of the vices and evil passions of man, leading him to sin and corruption, and then enforcing lessons of morality and treating the devil rather as an influence than a physical person.—Ib., p. 224.

In 1586, Abraham Saur von Frankenberg, Procurator of the Hessian Court at Marburg, published at Frankfurt-a.-M. the *Theatrum de Veneficis*, a collection of legal essays, for the benefit of the wielders of the secular sword. His object is to excite judges to the prosecution of witches, but most of the tracts treat the subject in a moderate spirit. He even includes Weyer's Preface to the *De Praestigiis Daemonum.*—Ib., p. 230.

Brunswick seems to be the earliest of the Protestant states to develop the witch-craze. In Göttingen, in 1561, the persecution was so vigorous "that scarce any old woman was safe from torture and the stake," according to a contemporary chronicle. In 1565, at Salzgitter and Lichtenberg, a number of witches were burnt, and in 1578, at Goslar, a comprehensive inquest was on foot. It is true that Duke Julius (1568–89) ordered his judges to proceed with caution and mildness, but of his son Heinrich Julius (1589–1619) it was said in his funeral sermon that he had rigorously punished witches and sorcerers in accordance with the word of God. In 1593 he ordered the preachers not to wink at sorcery and idolatry, and soon in every corner prosecutions were on foot. Already, in 1590, at Wolfenbüttel a number of witches were burnt, brought from various quarters. A chronicle states that the place of execution looked like a small wood, from the number of stakes. The duke's name became a byword to frighten children with, and Wolfenbüttel was a place of terror from the ferocity of the tortures in use. The persecution continued with varying intensity throughout the seventeenth century.—Ib., pp. 232–3.

In Lüneburg (Hanover) prosecutions increased during the seventeenth century. Pastor Krüger, in Hitzacker, complained of the cares and tears which the executions cost him,

and it was said that the executioner increased his gains by tampering with the water ordeal. It was said that some of the stakes put forth leaves, which caused the authorities misgivings.—Ib., p. 234.

In Nassau persecution was active, especially after 1628. The authorities established witch-committees in the villages and the preachers were ordered to dwell on the wickedness of witchcraft. The prisons were quickly filled and the persecution raged from 1629 to 1632, when a pause occurred because the private secretary of the Count was accused of being seen in the Sabbat. It revived in 1638 with renewed force.—Ib., p. 234.

Hesse-Darmstadt shared in the epidemic. At Katzenellenbogen (under Darmstadt in 1629) committees were formed to track witches.—Ib., p. 234.

In Brandenburg the persecution followed its course until restrained by the Great Elector (1660–88).—Ib., p. 235.

In Württemberg persecution was active. At Esslingen it lasted from 1662 to 1665, and the numbers involved were large. Over 100 witnesses were summoned to tell whether for some years back they had lost any cattle or had a sick child. In Reutlingen, on the accusation of some children from eight to twelve years old, who were held to be possessed, in 1666 and 1667 eleven women and three men were executed —some burnt and others beheaded (pp. 236–7). In Oberkirch and Oppenau, from July 3 to September 10, 1631, out of 41 accused, 32 women and 7 men were burnt (p. 237). In Calw and Wertheim were prosecutions caused by children of from seven to ten who said that they were carried by night to the Sabbat and accused women of taking them there. They were watched at night and found sleeping in their beds, but often stiff with cramps. They played the part performed by possessed nuns in Catholic lands. Their imaginations, excited by what they heard of these things, led them to have these visions.—Ib., pp. 236–9.

Cf. as to this the cases in England and Scotland, the stories of de L'Ancre and the report sent in 1612 to the Suprema of the Inquisition at Rome.

In Nördlingen (free city) prosecution began early. Three poor women were tortured, endured it and were discharged. The pastor, Wilhelm Lutz, preached against it and denounced the use of torture. The town-council reproved him and began afresh. In 1589 a number of old women were prosecuted.

In 1590, from May to September, eleven were burnt, some of good position. One of these was the wife of Peter Lemp, the treasurer; she endured two tortures, but in the third and fourth made confessions. The proceedings grew ever fiercer, but Maria Holl, from Ulm, the wife of the landlord of the Crown, endured fifty-six tortures without confession; finally the authorities of Ulm interfered and she was discharged, but sentenced to keep her house as a prison. At last the people revolted at the cruelty of the persecution and it ceased, but not until 35 women had been burnt in the little town within five years.—Ib., pp. 239–40.

The mother of astronomer Keppler was a widow, her husband lost in the wars. She was a restless, active woman, who busied herself in making salves and herb-teas and distributing them among her neighbors. While she was living at Leonberg (Württemberg), her friend, the wife of a glazier, fell sick and got advice from her brother, the barber of Prince Achilles of Württemberg; under his treatment she got worse and had occasional fits of insanity. The barber declared then that she could be cured only by the person who had bewitched her. She remembered a drink given her by the widow Keppler and ascribed her trouble to her. Then the family Keppler prosecuted her for slander, but, as Frau Keppler had slandered the Vogt, Einhorn, of Leonberg and also the barber, these instituted a prosecution against her for witchcraft. Johann Keppler was then stationed at Linz as astronomer to the Emperor Rudolph II. She returned from there to Leonberg to face the charge, and the trial lasted from 1615 to 1621. Keppler exerted himself to the utmost to save his mother. She was sentenced to torture with the reservation that she should be only set "in conspectu tormentorum," the executioner exhibiting to her all the different instruments and explaining how they worked. She was then seventy-four years old, and the ordeal took place September 28, 1621. She fell on her knees saying, "Do with me what you will, I have nothing to confess. If I were a witch I should have confessed it long since. I will rather die than lie about myself. If I confess anything under torture it will not be the truth." She was discharged and died the next year, 1622.—Ib., pp. 256–8.

Jo. Ewich, in 1584, at Bremen (where he was city physician) printed his *De Sagorum quos vulgo veneficos appellant natura*,

German edition in 1585 (Grässe, p. 51). He was a friend of Weyer's; he did not deny witches, but said they had no control over nature and could do no miracles. They should be punished, but with caution; torture should be used only when the guilt is confessed; the whole matter [he said], is obscure.—Ib., p. 269.

Jo. Grevius, pastor in Arnheim in 1622, issued a forcible book against torture and the worthlessness of the confessions extorted by it.—Ib., p. 282.

In 1660, in Flanders, a regulation of the witch-procedure provided that the search for the witch-mark should be made by a physician above suspicion and not by the executioner.—Ib., p. 282.

About the same time appeared, by order of the Great Elector, the judicial decision (Gutachten) of Professor Brunnemann limiting the use of torture to an hour and ordering it to be employed with caution. The accused is to be asked whether she has injured man or beast and how she knows that she has caused it. Also, as to accomplices, whether it may not be deceit of the devil, who presents appearances of people. A similar ordinance was issued in Mecklenburg in 1683.—Ib., p. 282.

In 1746 and 1747 there was a vigorous persecution in the Catholic districts of Württemberg. In 1751, in the little town of Endingen, then belonging to Austria, an old woman who, in smoking out her stable, caused a conflagration, was accused of having done it with the aid of the devil. Under torture she confessed to pact and to frequenting the Sabbat. The proceedings were approved by the theological faculty of Freiburg and she was burnt alive April 24, 1751, when she behaved as though crazy and had to be gagged and thrown upon the pile. On her way to the place of execution, she injured one man by looking at him and another by treading on his foot.—Ib., pp. 301–2.

The Alpine Regions.

Rapp, Ludwig.—*Die Hexenprozesse und ihre Gegner aus Tirol.* Innsbruck, 1874.[1]

The first use which Institoris seems to have made of Innocent's bull of December 5, 1484, was in Tyrol. It was presented to the Bishop of Brixen, Georg Golser, July 23, 1485, who on September 21 conferred on Institoris all the episcopal

[1] Mr. Lea was not acquainted with the revised edition, Brixen, 1891.

powers in the matter, but expressed the wish that he should adjoin to himself a secular assessor of the district. The Archduke Sigmund, sovereign of Tyrol, to whom the bishop communicated the matter, desired the bishop to appoint a commissioner, which he did in the person of Sigmund Samer, priest of Axam (near Innsbruck). The inquest commenced October 14, 1485, and speedily dissatisfied the bishop, who, in the middle of November, wrote to Institoris to depart for his convent, the sooner the better. Institoris, however, delayed and, on Ash Wednesday, 1486 (February 8), the bishop wrote again strongly expressing his surprise that Institoris was still in the diocese and so near the archducal court where the errors had arisen which caused so much bitterness. It was to be feared that, if he remained longer, the husbands and kinsmen of the accused women would commit violence on him. He, the bishop, would do what he thought proper by his power as Ordinary and the inquisitor should betake himself to his convent as speedily as possible, as he had already counselled, and cease to vex the people, for he had nothing more to do in the diocese. In a letter to the priests of Innsbruck the bishop expressed himself in even plainer terms.—Rapp, pp. 5–6.

The troubles in the archducal court were these. Some of Sigmund's courtiers sought to create discord between him and his second wife, Catherine of Saxony, whom he had married in 1484, by spreading the report that she had sought to poison him. They hired a worthless woman, the wife of a man named Geckinger, to hide herself in an oven and make out that a demon was concealed in it, who denounced many people, whereby they were imprisoned and sharply tortured. From the bishop's letter it would appear that Institoris had mixed himself up in the affair and thereby incurred the displeasure of all intelligent people, including the bishop.—Ib., p. 7.

At last Institoris left Tyrol, richly rewarded for his labors by Sigmund.—Ib., p. 8.

Then followed, in 1489, the publication at Constance of Ulrich Molitoris' little book.—Ibidem.

The Landtag of Tyrol held in August, 1487, at Hall in the Innthal, among other complaints against Sigmund included that recently, from groundless denunciations, many persons had been imprisoned, tortured and ill-treated, against God and the faith and the salvation of his princely grace.—Ib., p. 13.

In the Tyrolese Halsgerichtsordnung, issued in 1499 by Maximilian I with the advice of the Landstände, there is no allusion to sorcery and witchcraft. It is the same in the Landesordnungen of 1526 and 1532. It is not until the "Neureformirte Landesordnung der fürstlichen Graffschaft Tirol," published by the Archduke Ferdinand II in 1573, that "Zauberey und aberglaubige Wahrsagerey" are mentioned under prohibited acts (and then only in the "Policey-Ordnung" appended to the Landesordnung) and included in the minor offences subject to police. They are classed with blasphemy and punished with fines, of which one-fourth are to be given to the informer (but secretly, so that he should not be known); one-half to be spent in charity; and one-fourth to go to the magistrates for their trouble. If there was no informer, three-fourths went to charity.—Ib., pp. 13–14.

But this Landesordnung punishes with the stake and one-third confiscation the renouncing of the Christian faith, and, as this was a recognized feature of witchcraft, the latter must be comprehended in it.—Ib., p. 41.

On the other hand, in the Halsgerichtsordnung of Bamberg, of 1508, drawn up by Joh. von Schwarzenberg, sorcery is punished with death when death has been caused, and this was carried into the Carolina, approved in 1532. (All which I have elsewhere.—H. C. L.)—Ib., pp. 14–15.

In Tyrol—that is, the part immediately subject to the princes at Innsbruck—there are few witch-trials of the sixteenth century that are known; for the most part they occur in the seventeenth century. In Italian Tyrol (principality and diocese of Trent) they appear early and in great numbers. In the Innsbruck archives a document of the end of the fifteenth century gives a list of about 30 women of the Fleimser Thal imprisoned and condemned as witches by the Hauptmann Vigil von Firmian; most of them were executed—burnt or drowned—but some saved themselves by flight, and the property of all was confiscated. Numerous cases in Italian Tyrol are reported in the first half of the seventeenth century. In southern German Tyrol, at Brixen, there were in 1617–18, 1627–8 and 1643–4 some 20 cases, mostly from Thal Evas or Fassa.—Ib., pp. 16–17.

But the earliest known cases in German South-Tyrol are of 1506 and 1510, when 9 women of Völs were tried. Only the confessions of the accused are preserved.—Ib., pp. 17–18.

Rapp prints at the end the confessions of four women in

1510 and two in 1506 in Völs in South Tyrol. They are recorded as made "mit und ohne Marter"—that is, under torture and confirmed afterwards. The court consists of eleven jurymen presided over, in 1506, by the Richter Berchtold von Lafay (p. 170) and in 1510 by "Lienhart Peyffer der Zeit des edlen wohlgebornen Herrn Lienhart Herrn zu Völs, Hauptmann an der Etsch und Burggraf zu Tirol, *Malefizrichter zu Völs*" (p. 143). (This seems to mean that Lienhart Peyffer is Malefizrichter zu Völs in the time of Burgrave Lienhart.—H. C. L.) There was evidently an active persecution there at this time. Allusions are made in 1610 to others that had been executed and a number of names constantly recur through the confessions as associates with them in the Sabbat and evil doings. Among them are three or four men, but the bulk are women. The confessions in their details show considerable inventive powers, but in general they accord with each other, showing what was the current belief at the time and place. As a rule, when they want storms they ask the demon to bring them, but Juliana Winklerin tells how the demon taught her to do it by throwing a blade of grass in the air and forgetting those who were dearest to her (p. 167). There are very few allusions to commerce with the demon and it does not seem to form part of the Sabbat, as it is never mentioned in connection with it. The feasts there are composed of what they bring—all kinds of food and drink—chickens, sheep, pigs, cattle, bread and cheese, wine and children. The latter are cooked and eaten and then resuscitated, but they die soon afterwards, and it is necessary to keep the skeleton whole and together, as otherwise the child will be defective (p. 168). Animals also are revived. Of course all these articles must be carried through the air to the Sabbat; indeed Anna Oberharderin speaks of sitting on the cow which she took to the Sabbat (p. 145). All these things of course are taken from their neighbors. There is only one allusion to an ointment for flying—the rest seem to know nothing of it; indeed Juliana Winklerin describes the demon as calling for her and carrying her to the Sabbat (p. 162) and the Messnerin von Sankt Christanzen (wife of the sacristan) speaks of their flying in a troop with the demon (p. 160). She must have been well off, for, while the others speak of the devil never fulfilling his promises and his gifts disappearing, she says he gave her everything she wanted, even to handsome silver vessels (p. 160). Anna

Miolerin describes their flying to the cellar of the Crown inn at Terlan and nearly emptying a cask of wine, when by blowing into it it became full again—but the landlord got little out of it (p. 147).—Ib., pp. 143–75.

Even in north Tyrol, towards the end of the sixteenth century, proceedings against witches become more frequent and sharper. The government at Innsbruck issued repeated and urgent orders to magistrates to be watchful and to punish sufficiently those suspect of sorcery. But, as there were different opinions about the treatment of the matter, in September, 1637, the authorities of Innsbruck ordered the procurator Dr. Volpert Mozel to draw up an instruction on the subject, which he presented October 7. This document furnishes so informing a view of the current beliefs and practice that an abstract is worth presenting.

The first chapter defines suspicion justifying arrest: a person offering to teach sorcery or threatening another with sorcery; if a person after taking a drink offered by a suspect, has sudden pains or sickness, or after a flattering (friendly) touch a severe, unknown sickness occurs; if a child breathed upon or touched by a woman faints; if a man finds a woman sitting on a cask in a strange, locked cellar; if a man hears a strange disturbance during the night and in the morning finds a woman's cap or girdle or other article of female apparel; if a man wounds a cat or raven or other animal, and a neighbor is found hurt in the same manner—these and other things are very suspicious *indicia.*

Cap. 2—on witnesses. Evidence must be proved by two fitting witnesses under oath. But if a person is seized *in flagranti,* a single credible witness suffices.

Cap. 3. The judge is not lightly to imprison the person denounced unless he is otherwise ill-reputed for sorcery or when the accusations afford a strong presumption of sorcery, as, for example, if it is stated that the accused had a consecrated host, or witch-ointment, or human bones, or other suspicious object. Or when independent accusers agree in their accounts of what occurred in the Sabbat—murders and injuries of men and beasts, insults to the sacrament and other sacred things, so that the judge can conclude that they would not agree if the accused was innocent.

Cap. 4 treats of the "Böse Geschrei" or evil repute. Its cause should be considered, and if this is grounded on matters worthy of trust it should be heeded, but if only on empty gossip it should be disregarded.

Cap. 5. At least a day should intervene between arrest and audience. At first a simple examination and representation of the enormity of the crime and necessity of repentance, but never deceit in promising pardon for confession; questions should be general and the accused should never be told the facts and circumstances of the accusation. Proper questions are from whom he learned sorcery, why he renounced the Catholic faith, why he sought idolatry and lust, whether he had injured men and beasts—wherefore, when, with what words, acts or instruments. Then he is to be threatened with torture.

Cap. 6. Then follows torture, sharper or milder according to the weight of the evidence. If he overcomes torture appropriate to the suspicion, he is to be discharged until further evidence is received. Torture should not readily be extended more than an hour, and no one should be tortured more than thrice. His utterances under torture are not to be written down but only what he says after it.

Cap. 7. When the accused, with or without torture, has confessed the acts together with the circumstances, the judge must carefully investigate the circumstances, especially when he has confessed that he has buried or hidden sorcery material. When the circumstances cannot be found or identified, the accused is to be warned to tell the truth, and is, according to the nature of the case, to be tortured again.

Cap. 8. If the accused revokes before sentence, he is to be tortured again. If he gives such reasons as lead the judges to believe that his confession was made from faintheartedness and that he has done himself injustice, the judge may give him opportunity to prove these reasons and his justification. When any one revokes confession made under torture, he should be threatened with its repetition, or it should be repeated according to the character of the evidence. If he revokes after sentence, it should not lightly be executed, but he should be remanded to prison and treated as above. But if he has sufficiently confessed his crimes with all circumstances, the sentence is to be executed, for the revocation is evidently made only to interfere with justice.

Cap. 9. As regards accomplices it is more prudent to postpone the matter till after he has confessed sacramentally (that is, is about to be executed—H. C. L.). The judge should then kindly tell him that he should indicate them for the sake of his soul, for he is bound to this in conscience. The judge should not ask after individuals, naming them, unless

there are strong evidences against certain persons. And as little faith is to be placed in the utterances of those convicted of such grievous crimes, his denunciations should be confirmed under moderate torture, reminding him that he incurs certain and eternal damnation for false witness. If he revokes under torture, there is nothing more to be done.

Finally, the judge is reminded that as this matter is of the greatest importance he should in all doubtful cases seek the counsel of learned and experienced men.—Ib., pp. 18–24.

The comparative reasonableness of all this, in comparison with the practice of the time, Rapp explains by the influence of Father Tanner, to whom Mozel occasionally refers.

Of the numerous Tyrolese cases in the second half of the seventeenth century the one best known is that of Emerenziana Pichlerin, tried in 1679–80 at Lienz in the Pusterthal. She had four young children and was condemned with the two eldest, twelve and fourteen years old. She was executed on September 25, 1680, and her two children two days later. —Ib., p. 25.

How frequent these cases were is evidenced by the diary of Lorenz Paumgartner, a beneficiary at St. Leonhard in Meran from 1664 to 1681. He records that in a year and a quarter he had accompanied to execution 13 persons condemned for sorcery.—Ib., p. 25.

The acts of the processes against sorcerers in Meran are still preserved at Innsbruck in the Ferdinandeum. One of them was [the trial of] a beggar boy of fourteen named Lienhard, who had run away from home to escape the blows of his stepfather. In his wanderings he fell into the hands of the police in 1679 on a charge of making a tempest. He was so ignorant that he did not know his last name, but under the subjective questioning of the judge he confessed to having given himself to the devil named *Zauber-Jaki*, who taught him to make storms and create mice. He was beheaded and burnt at Meran, December 13, 1679. And with this boy there were executed three others, aged from eighteen to twenty-five, for the same crime.—Ib., pp. 25–8.

The persistence of these beliefs is shown by Dr. Joh. Christoph Frölich, Professor of Law in the University and Chancellor in the government, repeatedly rector of the University and dean of the Faculty and regarded as the most learned jurist of the land. Among his writings his "Nemesis Romano-Austriaco-Tyrolensis" is the most important, issued

in 1696 and reprinted in 1714. He died in 1729. He treats at great length of sorcery because at present many innocent persons are executed, while many undoubted witches escape; while if the matter were properly understood, it would be impossible for the innocent to suffer. With this object he proceeds to describe all the horrors of the Sabbat in full detail. Some authors regard the flight and commerce with incubi and succubi as illusions, but these "Hexen-Patrone" are conclusively refuted by theologians and jurists, among whom he specially recommends Del Rio. Naturally his instructions for procedure are of the sharpest character. The crime being of the worst description, slender indications are sufficient. Mere evil repute suffices for arrest and trial. As regards evidence of witches as to those seen in the Sabbat, he gives the reasons for and against without deciding, but he lays much more weight on those in favor of receiving it. It suffices to be the child of a witch, to be unable to look others fairly in the face; of course the witch-mark suffices. So with the use of torture; it suffices if the accused on arrest exclaims, "It is all over with me," for this is virtual confession of guilt. Audience should be given at once, lest the devil improve delay to visit and instruct the prisoner. He mentions the deceit of promising mercy for confession and the other practices of the old inquisitors, but adds that he will not recommend them to a conscientious judge. He has a firm belief in the charms which prevent witches from confession and in the efficacy of holy water to overcome them. At Salzburg recently a youth endured prolonged torture and said he could not confess; a drink of various blessed things was given, when he spat out some unknown sorcery material and forthwith confessed freely. The torture chamber should be constantly sprinkled with holy water, and a smoke be made with blessed herbs. The prisoner should be clad in new garments, but it is unnecessary to lift her up and carry her, or to lead her backwards into court so that she does not see the judge first, but the judge should fortify himself with benedictions, seeing that he has to strive not with a human creature, an old woman, but with the devil himself. As regards punishment, all who have an express pact with the devil and have given themselves to him body and soul are to be burnt, irrespective of whether they have wrought evil to man or beast. Those who, without such pact, have injured men or beasts with sorcery, are to be beheaded—also the "Segensprecher (magicians), Brun-

nengraber (I suppose well-finders with divining rod), Schatzgraber, Wahrsager und Teufelsbeschwörer (conjurors)." But if conjurations are not used, these superstitious practices may be punished with incarceration, scourging, exile or fines—the latter the most severe infliction for simple peasants. No judge has power to exempt a convicted sorcerer or witch from the fire or the sword, no matter how high in rank or position he may be. Voluntary repentance and confession, however, may substitute the sword for fire, but not after arrest. Children under seven are not to be punished, but to be handed over to paternal correction; but those of 14 are subject to the full penalties. Confiscation is a matter of course, in addition to the bodily punishment.—Ib., pp. 29–41.

Rapp tells the story of Tanner's delayed funeral, as related in F. X. Kropf's (S.J.) *Hist. Provin. Soc. Jesu Germ. Sup.* Tanner, at the age of sixty, worn out with dropsy, was seeking his native Innsbruck when he fell sick and died at Unken, May 25, 1632. The simple people of the house found among his effects a microscope given to him by his fellow Jesuit, P. Christoph Scheiner, a naturalist. In this instrument a fly had been placed and, seeing it magnified into a hideous beast with snout and claws, confined in so small a prison, they took it to be a demon confined in a magic glass and him to be a magician. They rushed to the priest and demanded that his corpse should not receive Christian burial in consecrated ground. Luckily the priest had some knowledge of optics. He took the fly out of the glass and showed it to them of natural size and then caught another, placed it in, and exhibited it magnified. Thus pacified, they permitted the obsequies.—Ib., p. 50.

In its commemoration of him, the University of Ingolstadt (where he had studied the humanities) describes Tanner as "Vir principum (sic) linguarum, eloquentiae, omniumque scientiarum ac historiae supellectili instructus inter primos sui temporis theologos numerandus."—Ib., p. 51.

Zingerle, Ignaz.—*Barbara Pachlerin und Mathias Perger.* Innsbruck, 1858.

In the little town of Meran (Tyrol), the diary of Laurens Paumgartner contains curt, business-like records of executions for witchcraft as though they were ordinary occurrences. The sufferers seem to be all men and to have been beheaded before burning. Thus August 11, 1679, we have 3—Melchior

Waltesbier, aged twenty-four, Carl Pfister, aged thirty, and Johann Caspar Pliem, fifty. Then August 18 there are 3—Georg Stocker, thirty, Georg Hofer, fifteen, and Josef Sailler, twenty. Then December 13 there are 4—Leonardt Tengg, fourteen, Erhardt Trenkwalder, twenty-five, Johann N., about twenty, and Valentin Tamerle, eighteen. In 1680, September 13, there are 2—Johann Schweigel and Lucas Olater, "juvenes." And November 14, 1—Matthieu Haensele, sixty years old.

When the executioner of Meran was summoned to Trent, on his return he excused the length of his absence by saying that he and his assistant had had their hands full in Tyrol and Salzburg.—Zingerle, Introd., pp. vii, viii.

The record of Barbara Pachlerin's trial begins August 28, 1540, with the reading of her confession under torture (*Urgicht*) in presence of the judge Roland Kabri and thirteen "ersamen weyssen," in the name of the Emperor. She confesses that thirty years before she and her sister Angel were taught witchcraft by their mother, "die Alt Stöckhlein." They renounced Christ and gave themselves to the devil, body and soul (pp. 1–5). There is a great deal about conjuring milk from neighbors, which seems the matter that most impressed the simple peasants (pp. 5–7). The devil gave her a box of ointment and a staff, by anointing which she could fly wherever she wished (p. 7). She taught witchcraft to "Die Rainerin" (p. 7). Tells of going to a Sabbat with three companions, some eighteen years before, where there are men and women from Meran, Maiss, Hafling and Schena, some of whom she names. One brings a child, who is cooked and eaten (pp. 7–11).

Since then she had often been to the Sabbat at various places on Thursday and Saturday nights. Everyone brought cattle or children. She had brought them—one a boy five years old and two girls, one a year old. Also two swine, which were eaten (p. 11).

Describes seven storms which with her mother and sister she had caused, which mostly did little damage. Describes others storms made with other comrades whom she names (pp. 11–14).

Three years ago she bewitched a cow of Wolfgang Hilder, with her comrades, and with the devil's help they ate it and it died soon after. (Children and animals are eaten and revived, but never live long afterwards.—H. C. L.) Describes

ten more cases of eating cattle, at various times up to the preceding summer. They had a kind of society, for in one case she speaks of the Schüssin who had joined their "Gspilschaft" (pp. 14–16).

All these cows, oxen and calves, as well as neighbors' children whom they bewitched and ate, were never well afterwards and soon died (p. 16).

Three years ago her husband, Pachler, with Rainer and Nördrer, went up the Tanzbach to bring out wood. On a Saturday night she, with the Rainerin and Agnes, went there to raise the stream and enable the men to get their wood out. She went home early and her husband got his wood through, but the Rainerin raised such a flood that the others lost their wood (p. 17).

She never made true confession, but concealed her witchcraft. She took the sacrament yearly, but always in the devil's name (p. 17).

Tells of three more storms—one only four weeks ago, with a whirlwind (p. 18).

Asked about various things found hidden in her cellar. The box of ointment was that given by the devil to anoint her staff to fly. The black powder was a living mouse reduced to a cinder, which she intended to give to the Pachmannin for alienating her husband. The human hair and needle and child's bone were charms to cause incurable sickness (pp. 18–19).

Confesses to intercourse with the devil, who had a cold nature. The Schüssin had been for thirty years in witchcraft and one of their society (p. 19).

This confession being read and confirmed by the Pachlerin under oath, she is condemned to be burnt for *malefiz* and delivered to the executioner of Meran to be led up the Öttenbach to the customary *Richtstat*, to be reduced to dust and ashes, together with her box of ointment and other things. Which judgment was executed (pp. 19–20).

Mathias Perger, called the *Lauterfresser*, still holds a place in popular memory. Many stories are told of him and among them those elsewhere attributed to Dr. Faust or Paracelsus.

May 12, 1645, Michael Gschraffer, judge of Rodeneck, puts the question to the jury (*Gerichtsgeschwornen*), Ulrich Oberburger, innkeeper, Thomas Huber, merchant, Balthasar Yhnsamb, mason, all of Mühlbach, what was to be proposed to do to Perger, the prisoner, on account of the evidence.

They unanimously replied that the judge should again earnestly examine him and cause his utterances to be set forth.—Zingerle, p. 23.

Made to give an account of his life. At least fifty-eight years old. Began as a shepherd. Names the various masters he had served, but, since the "Lanegger Geld" went, had not worked but wandered around. Believes what the Church believes; last confession was in 1642, for he ate meat on Ash Wednesday and dared not confess since, but he took communion every year. Asked why he lived in solitude and avoided towns and villages; says because he was afraid of arrest on account of his actions—he had been warned of this. Asked what books he possessed and had sold; mentions a number of charms, for thieves, weather, etc.; a book of astrology; an old heavy Bible—and the purchasers. Had been taught to read by peasants and had taught himself to write, but he knew no other language, though he could understand some words in the mass. Asked with whom he had chiefly associated, he mentions a number of persons in various places and what he did with them—showing that astrology and various more or less innocent superstitions were common. Finally he was asked whether he did not know witches and have to do with them. This he would not admit, although he had previously acknowledged it to Kachler and Gratzele (pp. 24–6).

The bundle he carried was opened and found to contain some clothing, some rosaries, pieces of bread, books of songs and devotion and other trifles (p. 26).

This concludes his first audience.

May 12, second audience. Asked why he had not confessed for so long, he replied that he knew many who often confessed without improvement; also that Pope Leo had granted an indulgence of one thousand hours for repeating the Ave Maria every hour. He had daily uttered the *Poppen-Segen* (?), which protects travellers from mischance. He also knew the *Diebsegen*, which protects from theft. He had taught it in 1632 to the count in Pichl, judge in Sarnthal. He knew no other benedictions than the threefold *Diebsegen*, which forces the thief to replace what he has stolen. (This superstition is still existent.) Tells of those for whom he had used it. To succeeding questions his answers were unsatisfactory and the audience closed (pp. 26–7).

May 22, at Kastelruth, the miller Simon Mayregger was summoned before the judge Simon Plunger and testified under oath that two days before Königstag (January 6) Lauterfresser had passed a night with him and said that for thirty years he had worked in mills and had often in the mornings heard mice and rats cry, "You do me harm." In the morning he asked for a milk-pap, but only got a piece of bread. Mayregger went to his mill to grind some wheat, but it would not work. He turned off the water and took out the hoppers and found much filth and quantities of mice and rats. He cleaned everything and tried to grind again, but since then, in spite of poisons and other means, had been greatly plagued with rats and other vermin (pp. 27–8).

May 26. Another audience before the judge and four jurymen. As he would confess nothing *in Güte*, especially about a destructive beast, at the request of the jurymen he was subjected to the thumbscrew. Asked in what jurisdictions and places he had been and what had been his actions. Tells various unimportant things. More than twenty years before he was with a peasant woman in Tefereggen when a great storm arose, and she hung a "Chrismbündlein" on a hedge-stake to stop it; it is effective and he has taught it to others. In summer a man should not wash on Friday. If he wears a shirt washed on that day he has much to fear from storms. Tells of various superstitious observances. Declares that he never caused storms (pp. 28–30).

After the audience, witnesses were summoned before various jurisdictions and questioned about him. At Schenegg, on June 2, there were twenty witnesses, but the most of them knew nothing of importance. Some said that by his experience he prophesied storms; he had a Bible and a Sibyl. At Feldthurn, June 7, there was a hearing. One tells of the books he had and had taught the witness the Latin alphabet; once as they went together over the mountain the hay-wagon capsized several times; he was fond of wine and prophesied storms. Others stated that once when he was beaten he said that they would drink little wine next year, and the vintage failed. (This seems to be the testimony of Kreuzweger, July 13—see below, p. 1102.—H. C. L.) He knew how to churn to make butter come; when he read the planets he held his hand before his face and laughed; he had an herb against worms and joked indecently with serving women and children; to show his power he had made a wagon capsize; he had

foretold that Anton Gasser would soon have a misfortune, which happened, for Gasser was upset with a pair of oxen and wagon; he would often foretell which spouse would die first; he often footed up the reckoning at table, and he carried books around in his sack; in Sarnthal he was of evil repute; he prayed but little and referred to texts in the Bible; he had predicted that the peasant Müller in Tschiffnon would be sixty-three years old; he had explained the peculiarities of the *Eich-Kitzelen* and from their worms and flies predicted storms; he had often read the heavens and played evil tricks (pp. 30–1).

June 8 there was a hearing at Sterzing, where the Herr Co-operator of Stilfes testified that he had taken some books from Perger and burnt them. Perger uttered threats and the next day Mayrl's wife was very sick. He had all kinds of books—Eulenspiegel, Schimpf und Ernst, Rollwagen, planet books and Margolfus (p. 31).

June 21 there was a hearing in Niedervintl. The judge, Michael Sigmund, warned those summoned to tell the pure truth. Martin Dorffer of Pfunders said that Perger had six times spent the night with him; he had predicted a storm and read the planets. Hans Weisssteiner said the Lauterfresser had given his wife the book Tobias for a shirt. He had three or four times exchanged books and had given him a sermon book of ten Elders of the World and Sigfried, but had demanded them back after a year; he had stolen from him a book of rosaries and, when reproached, only laughed; when he knew the name and the mother of a person he could read the planets; had thus foretold that Weisssteiner would be neither too rich nor too poor; he was also skilled in herbs and roots. Andrä Raders told that Perger had said on the Bozner Gitsch that he could no longer read the planets and had therefore inquired the way over the Hägelstein. Andrä Pirgstaller said that Perger more than thirty years before had read many books, *e. g.*, Eulenspiegel, Dr. Faust and the Life of Christ; and said that by practice he understood the weather. On the Nativity of the Virgin (September 8) he foretold cold, which came. Christian Hueber said that Perger had merry songs and jests for serving-folk and tried to sell books; had bought of him an old Bible for 30 kr. Sara, wife of Jacob Huber, said that Perger had foretold great heat about St. Bartholomew's (August 24)—he looked through a glass. Martin Spöcker told that Perger said there was no rain, but it would rain if the wind held; in the dog-days there would be fevers

and about St. Lawrence and Bartholomew such heat as had not been known. Andrä Tulp testified that he had bought a *Fernrohr* of Perger for 36 kr. Christ. Prigglechner said Perger twenty years ago read the planets for the servants; the year before he had returned and asked for a *Lauters* and a *Weisses* (?); he burnt a piece of *Juppen* (?) with his glass and later he burnt a book not wholly pleasing. Karl Schiner said that Perger with a stone and reed made for the children in the chamber snow, which, however, did not lie down (pp. 31–2).

June 27 he was brought out again. Sebastian Hofstetter, barber of Brixen, shaved and examined and reported that he could find no witch-mark. It was suggested that the mouth be examined and there was found on the tongue a mark like scissors (pp. 32–3).

As he denied that he practiced sorcery or had an evil spirit, it was decided to torture him; he was bound, hands and feet, weights attached as if to hoist him, but without result. He was then hoisted, but still denied sorcery, although in Lüfen he had conjured a little book out of a chest; he admitted only that he had uttered and taught the lesser and greater *Diebsegen* to some people (p. 33).

July 3 he was confronted with Simon Mayregger (the miller of Kastelruth, see above, p. 1100), but he denied knowing him (p. 33).

July 13. Hans Kreuzweger deposed that Perger was once beaten by the miners of Unter-Inn and in revenge he made the cold weather and snow which destroyed the vintage (see above, p. 1100). He denied it or knowing the art of weather-making and said he had heard this cold and snow ascribed to a woman (see above, p. 1100). Confronted with Christina Pacherin he said he had not conjured the book out of the chest. Georg. Gargitter accused him of making snow and hail—also Karl Schiner—he denied to both (pp. 33–4).

Torture then repeated. He hung in the strappado with weights for three-quarters of an hour without tears or sweat. He did not confess, but prayed God and the Virgin to take him. He was let down and earnestly warned to confess the real ground of the accusations, seeing that the witnesses were present. Only by confessing his guilt could he escape further torture (p. 34).

He then confesses to acts of sodomy with men and lust with women (pp. 34–5).

As he would not confess he was hoisted again with a heavier weight and then with the greatest, weighing 200 pounds,

added, but did not confess; he sweated a little but shed no tears. After an eighth of an hour he was loosened and threatened with another hoist. He said that at Landeck a woman, who might have been a spirit, solicited him and he did not deny her. Then the jurors concluded to refer the case to the court of the count and to call in Dr. Christof Zeiller as to further proceedings with the obstinate man (p. 35).

August 7, by advice of Dr. Zeiller, it was determined to examine him again and, if he did not confess, to repeat the torture with the heaviest weight. This was done without result. Then for two nights and a day he was placed on a trestle and when he would sleep he was beaten with rods and other things; his feet were squeezed together with irons, his hands tied behind his back with a cord. Finally his resolution gave way. The woman of Landeck he said was named Belial; she had invited him and promised to marry him and make him rich. She had given him a thaler and a book written in red in which it was said she was an evil spirit. This was in 1623 or 1624. He renounced the Virgin and gave himself to the Evil One. Then she met him in a wood and made him renounce Christ and the Virgin, drew some blood from his great toe (which pained for three days) and made him write with it. Then in a certain place he met some women, one of whom had a goose's foot, who took him to the Sabbat, where he ate and drank and was well treated; after the dance there was intercourse. The devil brings the witches together from a distance, so that they may not be known (apparently this to avoid having to inculpate others—H. C. L.). Between Imst and Stans the beautful woman Belial met him again and solicited him and he yielded. He then wrote with blood on the paper which she took. When in 1643 there was the great storm at Mühlland he was at Lüfen. Asked about tempest-raising, he said the woman told him that he could cause one by casting a stone and a hair of a woman into a pool or running water. The woman gave him the book with the *Diebsegen*; he found it in his satchel. He had caused storms with a stone, hair and dust. Belial taught him; he had intercourse with her the night before his arrest. In 1640 he had seen twelve witches dance on the Schlernkofel; one of them made music on a shalm pipe; she wore a feather and pointed shoes; he had connection with one; he did not know how he got there but woke up at Thiers. On this confession he was released from the trestle at 6:30 in the morning (pp. 35–7).

Then he continued. Had been once before on the Schlernkofel where fifteen witches and three men, who were dressed as gypsies, danced. One looked like Jakob Gasser of St. Andrä. A piper and fiddler made music; there was no lack of wine. Had learned to conjure the evil spirit from a book given him by Jakob Gasser. It was lewdness that led him to subject himself to the evil spirit. This had marked him under the tongue, which made an impediment in his speech, and took fourteen days to heal. The devil promised that he should never want, but did not keep the promise (p. 38).

Had been at a Sabbat on the Vilnöser Alm, where six witches danced, and had intercourse. The devil sometimes appeared as a captain on horseback with red insignia, and sometimes as a pilgrim. When he comes the witches bow to him. The Sabbat is usually held in the autumn. Had often had to appear there against his will. When the witches do not come the devil punishes them by scourging till the blood comes, and this had once occurred to him in Thiers, when he suffered long from it. The witches come from distant places, so that they may not be recognized. Once in going from Tefereggen to Antholz he saw the Lebenführer at a witch-dance (p. 38). This Lebenführer was Bartlma Kohler, who was imprisoned at Rodanck on suspicion of causing storms in 1646 (p. 38, n. 6).

As wizards he could only name Jakob Gasser and Dominicus the fiddler. At the dances there was food, especially fresh meat, fowls, such as geese, and pork, kid and lamb, and chamois, but hunger was never satisfied. The food was unsalted and not well flavored. After the banquet for a short time they talked and had intercourse (p. 39).

At Pra in Lüsen Belial came to him and had intercourse (p. 39).

In 1643 he caused the great storm at Mühland by throwing in water at Ober-Lugen a *Todtennadel* (?), woman's hair and dust. In 1639, when the vines were frosted, he had caused it with the same things, together with splinters of pine and bits of bell-metal, throwing them into the stream by Bozen Talfer. Belial helped him, and there was rain, wind and snow and all the fruits were destroyed (p. 39).

To raise wind he took a reed and made a *Todtennadel* with viper's tongue inside and recited, "Kumm, kumm Osterwind, Der gegen Tauern ist," and blew into the reed. He had often done this (p. 39).

At Langer, in 1643, Belial asked if he wished to become a bear, so that he could have all the meat he wished. Belial gave him a skin which made him seem a bear. He wore it for nine weeks at Lüfen, Afers and Vilnöse, during which he killed five or six oxen and ate the best parts. Then he returned the skin (p. 40).

He had sucked milk from goats. For a girl named Maria he had put lime in the milk, but without hurting her. He had seen Belial at his window the previous night. He had given hazelroot to girls to prevent pregnancy (p. 40).

Belial gave him a yellow ointment with which he could transport himself when he wished. Once at Kreidenfeld he went to a cellar with a servant girl, where with a straw they drank wine out of the casks and had intercourse (p. 40).

In 1628, near Galli, he went on a poker to Meran to a house where the peasant woman gave him sweet must to drink; thence he went to a vineyard where he ate the fruit (p. 40).

Belial taught him to take the sacrament out of his mouth. He did this at Gossensass and put it in a cloth. In confession of 1641 he suppressed this (p. 41).

At Brennerbad he sold this host for six kreutzer to a black merchant (p. 42).

In 1643 Belial on Allsaintsday ordered him to damage the fruits and, as he refused, strangled him terribly. Then in 1644, on the eve of Blutstag,[1] when at Lüfen he lay at Stindl's, the son of Pärdeller, Belial choked him so strongly that he fled to another room. About three years ago, when he was at Matheis Mair's at Dorf, Belial ordered him to go to Tschötsch and make weather to destroy the vines and, when he refused, seized him by the throat and strangled him severely. In 1632 he had seen Mair at a Sabbat on the Schlern, or at least a person strongly like him. Had also seen him at the dance on the Antholzer Alm. Had taught Mair the art "gut zu hausen" (?)—or perhaps Mair had learnt it from a book belonging to Jakob Gasser (p. 41).

When the Klausnerin (female hermit) at Feldthurn was pregnant he wished her an evil confinement, because she would not give him wine, and he placed there a Todtennadel. She suffered greatly in childbed (p. 41).

In the wagon of Frauner at Feldthurn he had placed the names of evil spirits, whereby the hay often fell out (p. 41).

[1] Frohnleichnamstag, Corpus Christi day, May 26, 1644.

In the comet year, 1618 (?), he had put fern-seed into a quill from a white goose, stuffed it with wax and given it to Matheis Mair, telling him it would make him *gut hausen* and successful in litigation (p. 42).

Belial taught him Saturn, Jupiter, Mercury, Mars, Venus, the moon and dog-star (p. 41).

Near Scharnitz the evil spirit Stix appeared to him, splendidly dressed and gave him the *Galgenmannl* named *Alraun* (see Grimm, Mythology). It had a head, two feet and two hands; it was stag-colored and wrapped in yellow silk and put in a *Gestattele* (?). Stix told him to keep it carefully wrapped up and occasionally bathe it and it would bring luck in all things. He gave it to Mair for a measure of wine, three kreutzers and a loaf of bread. Mair is marked by the devil on the left arm, left thigh and the heel. His demon is called Malchus and is a knight. On this account his crops are always good, while his neighbors have nothing.

This ends the audience. Perger is led to his cell, where for fear of Belial he earnestly asked for holy water and consecrated things (p. 42).

August 11. Is ordered to name all persons with whom he had to do, but to accuse none who are innocent. He at once named Matheis Mair. Also, on the last of May, 1639, he had seen the shoemaker of St. Andrä at the Sabbat on the Antholzer Alm; he is marked behind the left ear. Also his father had been at a Sabbat, and both had the demon Belial. The old shoemaker had the mark under the Adam's apple (pp. 42–3).

August 14. He made the following additions. The old Gasserin at Gifen is a witch, whom he had seen in 1639 at the Sabbat on the Antholzer Alm, and the last time on the Schlernkofel; she is unchaste, chattering and uncertain; her mark, gray and the size of a rye kernel, is on the nape. Also the old Eggerin, a small lean woman, is a witch and her mark is on the left knee; at the Sabbat she laughed and gaggled. Peintnerin, the old innkeeper (woman), has the mark like a small pea under the left armpit. Jenewein taught sorcery to the old Pachpartin and Juter and Hinteregger. A long black thing like a dragon with terrible wings took Jenewein to the Sabbat; does not know where his mark is (pp. 42–3).

Questioned about Jakob Gasser, said he was a wizard, with a mark under the left armpit, the size of a *Glufenknopf* (?). His demon is named Stix. When in autum, 1643, the great

storm was at Feldthurn, he was there. Also the Mill-wife (she is Agnes, wife of Weingartner) and another woman who sells goods at Brixen were then at the Radlsee (a place of Sabbats) on account of "Schnaudersgefahren" (?). The daughter of the *Kazingerin* made the storm; Belial brought the things for her to do it (an unintelligible list given) and she conjured the storm in the name of all devils, and all the above persons had to repeat it, for the evil spirits threatened to cast them into the lake. The conjuration was: "I conjure you, Satan and Beelzebub, that you come and raise the water to a thick cloud on high and the cold north wind come and make ice and the ice become fragments and be discharged from the clouds and the wind drive it down on houses, fields, properties and vineyards and then come the weight of the water like a cloudburst." The asked-for storm came; the evil spirits drew from the lake a heavy cloud that ever grew larger. Then she went to the wood above Mellaun, where one goes to Afers; two small black men with horns took her there on a stake, from Radlsee. He (Perger?) then went to Velter; the others went home by night by the path to Platzburg and Clerent. Bell-ringing in time is good for storms, but later it is scarcely so (pp. 43–4).

This imaginative picture would indicate that storm-raising was not so easy as elsewhere described.

He and Jakob Gasser had long consulted what to do so that Gasser should get more grist. At last Gasser asked an evil spirit to advise him. Then they went to the Pälzlereck, where a boy hung on the gallows; the spirit lifted Gasser up; he took the boy's two little balls (I suppose the testicles—H. C. L.). Perger watched under the gallows. Then to Afers, where Gasser was miller, and the spirit forbade him to tell anyone. The next day Gasser buried the testicles under the mill, in a cloth with blessed salt and candle, so that the spirit could not take them away. The result was that many people would bring their grain to grind nowhere else than to him. Stix could give poor people money and control over other spirits. These have classes, like Grafen, Pfalzgrafen, Markgrafen, Landgrafen, Burggrafen. The Graf has under him those who see to the dances and weather and help in their trades those who practice them. The Pfalzgraf is the ruler over treasures and hidden money; he beguiles people and brings them pretty women as lovers. The Markgraf helps in war and conflicts,

but his help is illusory. The Landgraf renders pursued men invisible. The Burggraf helps in the greater administrations of lands and people. Belial told him all this. But subsequently Perger withdrew all this and denied it (pp. 44–5).

September 15, there assembled at Rodaneck the judge, M. Gschraffer and the jurors Christopf Azwanger, Simon Winckler, Thomas Hueber, and Balthasar Ihnsamb, burghers of Mühlbach, Andrä Mayr of Dorf, Bartl Peniller of Karnoll, Gall Peintner of Schabs, Veit Kaltenhauser of Raas, all inhabitants of the Rodaneck jurisdiction. After weighing the utterances of Perger and reading the consultations of Dr. Christ. Zeiller, the prisoner was brought in and his left foot was examined by the attendants, but as it was all swelled the devil's mark could not be found (p. 45).

Perger again confessed that the devil had marked him on the toe. Asked about the "Kügelschen" (boy's testicles) which he had had at the time of the storm at Mühland, he replied "Man soll es suchen." Asked if he had dishonored the Host more than once or had bewitched children or persons, he adhered to what he had said, adding that he remembered nothing else. He was told to tell the truth or else be placed on red-hot iron plates; his confession was read over to him, when he confirmed it and offered to swear to it. Finally it was determined to make inquiry about him in other jurisdictions (pp. 45–6).

September 19, there appeared at Rodaneck various persons who had been summoned, to whom was read 26, tit. 24 of the Landesordnung. Christian Taler, of Oberkarnol, said that in May, 1644, he passed a night with Matheis Mair's son-in-law in Grünthaler. They saw near there two dead oxen and a moderate-sized bear which ran down and ate them. As the beast saw them, it made a sound and hurried away. In the Villgeier Alm a steer was killed by a bear; on the Aferer Alm a bear killed an ox. The miller Weibele was suspected of knowing more than other people (p. 46).

Wolfgang Schäger of Afers said that J. Gasser of St. Andrä had much grist to his mill and lived well; had never heard anything against him. Matheis Mair once economized rigidly, but later gained property (p. 46).

Peter Pinnider of Afers said there was general talk why M. Mair and J. Gassen lived so well. Mair's crops at Dreschen were larger than those of others (p. 46).

Wolfgang Schäger and Ulrich Stäbinger said that people

would willingly drive Gasser and Mair away from Afers (p. 46).

All these witnesses confirmed their evidence under oath (p. 46).

September 26, a hearing was held in Sarnthal. Five witnesses stated that in 1641 on St. James' day (July 25) in the evening there came a great storm in Oberstückel from Jungbrunnen and on the Alm and in the woods did great damage. On St. Anne's day (July 26) it was so cold that there was frost on the Alm and the pasture was almost destroyed. Twenty years ago there came from Jungbrunnen a great storm and did much harm to the crops in Revier Oberstückl.

Four witnesses stated that six or seven years ago on Good Friday there were a fearful storm and snow, so that the fruit was damaged. No one, however, could testify that it thundered on Pentecost (p. 47).

October 9, more persons came on summons to Rodaneck. On the question as to the bear, Leonhard Taler and Matheis Niederegger of Afers testified that in 1643 the bear had killed for them three oxen as they were shepherding on the Ploisacker Alm. Also in 1644 the bear killed many oxen, and three wolves were seen. This they swore to (p. 47).

October 11, the judge and jurors determined that a visitation should be made to the house of Matheis Mair and an investigation whether there was anything suspect of sorcery at the Mill-wife's. Then those accused of sorcery by Perger—M. Mair of Dorf, J. Gasser of St. Andrä, the Mill-wife, wife of Paul Weingartner, miller of St. Andrä, and old Katerin of Gifen—examined. The Mill-wife, without torture, said she had thrice repeated to the yet living Fröllerin the "Vergicht-Segen" (charm against gout?); she had the book from a locksmith at Brixen; she and Andrä and M. Mair made pilgrimage to St. Magdalena, where they repeated the "Krongebeth." She knew nothing of Perger; at Easter and Pentecost, when new baptismal water is made, she took some of the old as it was poured out and carried it home; the particles of the Host found in her house were given to her daughter Salome by the schoolmaster at Brixen, with instructions to guard them carefully. The others made unimportant or no admissions (pp. 47–8).

Then Perger was brought out, when he revoked his confession and declared that he had never had dealings with evil spirits. He was at once remanded to his cell. Mair and old

Katerin were allowed to return home under oath to appear when summoned. Weibele and Gasser were held under custody. Finally it was resolved to threaten Perger with the red-hot iron plates (p. 48).

October 12, he was brought out and obstinately insisted that he had had nothing to do with demons. The red-hot plates were brought out on which he was to be placed, when he confirmed his confession and was remanded. On the same morning he tried to suffocate himself with a wisp of straw, but the gaoler came in time and pulled it out all bloody. Questioned as to his object, he said it was through fear of the glowing plates that he wished to put an end to his misery (p. 48).

The judge and jurors resolved to confront Perger with those he accused, and extracts were made from his confession (p. 48).

October 13. He confessed anew much that he had denied before witnesses(?). Gasser only admitted that he had recited the "Poppensegen" to a boy who was at point of death. The Mill-wife was brought forward and Perger declared that she had been with him to the Radlsee. In the afternoon Perger confirmed his previous statements in the presence of Gasser and old Katerin. The attendant was ordered to bring M. Mair and the two shoemakers (pp. 48–9).

October 14. Gasser, Peter Oberpurger, shoemaker at St. Andrä, and the Mill-wife were examined about the books and other things found on the visitation (p. 49).

Peter Oberpurger admitted owning book No. 1, but denied as to book No. 2. Agnes the Mill-wife, wife of Weingartner, admitted ownership of a book; also that, when she was at Gasser's seeking to get the Sibylline prophecies, she found a card with a conjuration for the fields. She heard that Gasser and Mair were seen at night in the fields with a light. Gasser admitted ownership of a book, but denied that of the card in it (p. 49).

October 14. The judge and jurors resolved that Gasser, Peter Oberpurger and the Mill-wife, as they would admit nothing about the books found, should be taken to Mühlbach in custody (p. 49).

October 16. Balthasar Stäbinger, toll-gatherer at Afers, was examined at Rodaneck and admitted that Gasser had gone to his brother Math. Mair to ask him about the *Jausch*(?); people had seen Gasser with lights in the fields; Mair had said

that when one sets up anything in the fields in a place where one can see all around, all things flourish; whether this meant a man or something else he did not know (p. 49).

Zingerle here introduces extracts from examinations of Perger in the handwriting of the judge, Gschraffer. They inculpate various other persons as witches and give their devil-marks. Agnes the Mill-wife, it seems, is the daughter of old Kazingerin and is denounced as a witch; her demon is in the shape of a soldier with a white hat and black feather, green shirt, black doublet, ashen breeches, red stockings and long, white pointed shoes. He also admits reading aloud from Lutheran books, sermons, bibles, etc. The devil teaches his disciples to practice sorcery, to deceive, to do evil, to move boundary stones and work on holidays (pp. 49–51).

October 18. The judge and twelve jurors assembled in the court house at Mühlbach. The jurors demanded that Perger should read the ban of outlawry as he had sworn on October 14, and as is universally customary. It was then resolved: (1) To let the delinquent have religious instruction by the priest of Alveins. (2) To have his mouth examined for the witch-mark by the military surgeon Sebastian of Brixen and the barber of Mühlbach. (3) That the judge should summon the jurors on the morning of Whitsunday to frame the verdict. As very suspicious books had been found with Gasser, he should remain in prison (p. 52).

October 26. The jurors assembled to frame the verdict. Some of them first gave their ballots (*Stimmzettel*) that he should be torn with pincers, but they abandoned this. The verdict itself is not extant, but according to the legend he was condemned to the stake and was carried to the place of execution in a copper kettle, so that he might not get some earth with which to juggle (p. 52).

His name of Lauterfresser is still used in Tyrol to frighten children and there are popular legends current about him. He is said to have dwelt in the underground passages of the castle of Rodaneck, to which he often carried children. His power of transformation was unlimited. Once he took the shape of a post by the roadside. A glass dealer came along and placed his package on the post, which vanished, and the glass was shivered by the fall. The pedlar tore his hair, but, seeing a fine steer in the place of the post, led it to the market and sold it. The purchaser, rejoicing, took it to his stable, but it flew away in the form of a large fly (pp. 53–4).

I have set forth this case at some length, for it illustrates various points in practice. The court consists of a judge and jurors, or sworn assessors—sometimes only two or three, but the full number seems to be twelve, required for judgment. They vote and conduct the proceedings, and the abandonment of the pincers by some of them shows that there was discussion and deliberation. They have full jurisdiction and do not have to refer the matter to a higher body or a university, though they apply to a jurist, Dr. Zeiller, for advice before torturing him.

There was no undue haste, as the trial lasted from May 12 to October 26. There was an earnest desire to obtain all possible evidence to justify condemnation, as the inquests held in all the places around and the summoning of witnesses from other jurisdictions show. The torture as usual was unsparing.

He was evidently a bright, intelligent man, who had given himself some education—enough to make him an object of suspicion, which in his wandering, hand to mouth existence assisted him in a livelihood among a thoroughly superstitious population, on whose weaknesses he preyed. Yet in the evidence against him there was nothing but the baldest conjecture. Every unusual tempest or frost is attributed to witchcraft, and, if a bear kills an ox, it is a witch transformed.

When exhausted endurance compels confession, it is a rambling inconsequential recital, evidently composed as he went along to satisfy his torturers by connecting himself with the storms and other incidents that had impressed the district. His accusations of accomplices evidently made little impression, as Gasser was the only one prosecuted, and this on account of the books found in his possession. His account of the Sabbat has some distinctive features.

Odorici, Federico.—*Le Streghe di Valtellina e la Santa Inquisizione, con documenti inediti del secolo XVI.* 1861 (s.l.).

There seems to have been an active persecution in the Valtelline in 1523. The Inquisitor of Como, Fra Modesto Scropheo da Vicenza, goes there on learning "che in questa terra et Comune de Sondrio siano molte persone infecte et maculate de la maladeta heresia, appostasia . . . et de la prophana et execrabile secta de le strie." This is from the sentence against Bartolameo Scarpategio, published by the Inquisitor from a platform in front of the Inquisition, September 28, 1523. The sentence recites that Scarpategio denied; then was tortured and confronted with four accusing witnesses as having seen him "nel zogo del bariloto, nel loco de Tonale," but he still denied. (This shows that he was only one of a number—their names are mentioned, showing them to be already condemned.—H. C. L.) Subsequently, however, he confessed all the details of the bariloto, or Sabbat, and to killing people. Then again he retracted and persisted in his retraction, showing him to be impenitent. Finally the process is examined by the jurist Messer Johanne Antonio Piperolo,

"degnissimo vicario del Magnifico Domino Capitano de Valtolina," with whose counsel the sentence is rendered and with the consent of Guglielmo de Citadini, vicar of the Bishop of Como. (I suppose this was Venetian territory and the assent of the secular ruler was requisite.—H. C. L.) The sentence is relaxation to the Lieutenant of the "Magnifico Domino Capitano nostro de Valtolina qui presente," to be punished according to "le sancte decretale e le sacre lege Imperiali." Also by confiscation, his property "da esser distribuiti secondo li privilegii et consuetudine approbata del offitio de sancta Inquisitione," all his gifts, sales, contracts, etc., being annulled.—Odorici, pp. 91–101.

Although the sentence recites the course of the trial, there is no allusion to the witch-mark, which could not have been omitted if it was part of the proof in this time and place.

Another sentence, August 9, 1523, on two women, "Margarita dicta madregna" and "Augustina dicta bordiga"; same formulas as the last—denial, torture, confrontation and confession—but they did not retract. In place of this the sentence says that their confessions were not complete, showing them to be unrepentant; and this suffices for their condemnation. In this and the previous sentence it is stated that the culprits gave the names of those they saw at the Sabbat, "quali al presente se taceno per il meliori." But, without these, in the two sentences there occur in all ten names, the whole of whom are evidently convicted.—Ib., pp. 103–16.

Odorici says (p. 140) that Fra Modesto in less than two months tried 30 persons, 2 were acquitted, 7 burnt alive, and the rest were still in prison.

Odorici prints also a receipt of Vicenzo de' Bonini, November 27, 1518, *caneparius* (fabbriciere) of the school of San Pietro Martire and of the Inquisition, for 48 lire di terzioli for the expenses of Petrina detta Guerra in the prison of the Inquisition at Morbegno.—Ib., p. 117.

The Dominicans were driven from Como early in the fourteenth century and took refuge at Morbegno, but it was not till 1455 that they had permission to build a church and convent. The Inquisition was established there and had its prison, which the above document shows was still functioning in 1518. The Three Leagues had not long before introduced their government in the country. The furious zeal of Fra Modesto da Vicenza led to the League's replacing the Inqui-

sition with a secular court. The revolution of 1620 led to its reintroduction, but it was abolished for ever by the treaty of 1638 between Spain and the Grisons.—Ib., pp. 121–3.

A letter of Doge Marco Barbadigo, December 10, 1485, to the podestà and the captain of Brescia, recites that the Inquisitor Fra Antonio da Brescia had presented himself, representing that in Valcamonica many heretics exercised witchcraft and praying that the rettori should extirpate it. The doge professes to be much perturbed by these demoniac frauds, wherefore by the authority of his Council he orders that at the requisition of the Inquisitor arrests be made and the parties brought under careful guard to Brescia—whomsoever the inquisitor shall at any time declare to him (the doge). All possible diligence shall be shown that they be detained in Brescia and be severely punished when their demerits demand it. Expenses to be paid from the goods of the delinquents, or, if they have none, from the moneys of our camera.—Ib., p. 125.

Thus, while authorizing persecution, the ducal supervision is preserved.

Agostino Barbadigo, doge, and the Savi, September 15, 1486, to the podestà and captain of Brescia: "The papal legate and the patriarch have exhibited processes made by the Inquisitor against some heretics of the district, and, as they have assured us that they were properly conducted according to law, we order you to lend the aid of the secular arm so that the sentences of the inquisitor be executed without delay."—Ib., p. 128.

Other letters to the same effect of October 18 and 23, that of the 18th ordering that, as the bishop has requested, the sentences are not to be executed without his consent and "non cujusdam brevis apostolici pro esecutione."—Ib., p. 129.

This shows that a pretty active persecution was on foot. Also that the Savi's authority was requisite.

September 30, 1486, Innocent VIII to Inquisitor Antonio da Brescia. When the secular authorities demanded to see the processes, the pope orders him to refuse to submit them and to excommunicate the magistrates if they do not execute the sentences within six days, "cum hujusmodi crimen haeresis sit mere ecclesiasticum."—Ib., p. 129. (Also in Peña, Append. ad Eym., p. 84.)

Agostino Barbadigo, April 11, 1487, to the podestà and

captain of Brescia: Expresses displeasure that the inquisitor, after the matter of the heretic women, should have aroused fresh troubles and have published in his preaching the excellent doctor Alberto de' Alberti, who was our vicar, as a heretic; and, not content with this, should have cited him to defend himself on account of the advice which he gave you in the matter of the said women. As we will not suffer those who represent the person of our rettori, which is ours, to obey their mandates and be noted with infamy, we order you to see the said inquisitor and order him, as he values our favor, to abstain from such things and to suffer the doctor to live in peace, and, if he has done otherwise, to retract and abolish it. If he does otherwise, we will not endure it.

April 23, the doge complains that the inquisitor has persisted and has cited Dr. Alberto to appear at Rome; he repeats the command that the rettori make him understand that the Republic will not suffer such things.

On May 28 the doge expresses extreme displeasure that the inquisitor or his vicar is molesting the notaries who drew up the advice of Dr. Alberto, that one had been arrested and then released under bail. We will not endure this and order you to order the vicar to abstain from action against the notaries, who only did what they were ordered; he must release the bail and, moreover, must forthwith present himself before us.—Ib., pp. 130–3.

The documents are thus explained by Odorici. In 1485 Frate Antonio, inquisitor of Brescia, reports to the Republic that in Edolo in Valcamonica he had found heretics and witches, whose crimes he describes; he asks and obtains the arm of the Council of Ten to destroy by punishment this heretical and maleficent sect. On December 10, 1485, the Republic writes to the podestà and captain to give him the necessary aid, as his proceedings were conducted with rectitude. The Bishop of Brescia was not called in to concur in the sentences and applied and procured that they should not be executed without the consent of the curia (I suppose the spiritual court—H. C. L.), as they were purely ecclesiastical. The inquisitor then obtains from Innocent VIII the bull of September 30, 1486. The magistrates resist and the inquisitor proceeds against Dr. Alberto, the vicar of the podestà, and the notaries—eliciting the above letters.—Ib., pp. 141–44.

In 1548 the Republic required that the rettori should assist in the inquisitorial trials, a rule which it repeated when the

inquisitors endeavored to disregard it. The result is seen in the trials on Venetian territory from 1547 to 1550, in which out of 63 prosecutions for heresy and witchcraft there was but a single execution.—Ib., p. 148.

See *Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies*, pp. 131–2, for the restrictions laid on inquisitorial trials.

The Tonale which figures in all these cases as the scene of the Sabbat is a great mountain at the head of the valleys of Sole, Camonica, and Tellina, with a plain on the summit.—Ib., p. 153.

A notice, November 24, 1714, to the creditors of Valento di Romerio Romeggione di S. Rocco, beheaded in 1703 for witchcraft, to present their claims against his confiscated estate held by the podestà, shows that under the Grisons the persecution of witchcraft continued until the eighteenth century. And the belief in it is not even yet extirpated in the Valtellina.—Ib., pp. 119–23.

The Alpine regions were the home and nursery of witch persecutions. At one end we have seen what was the slaughter in the Valtelline and the region around Como in the early days. At the western extremity, the narrow territory of the Pays de Vaud signalized itself at a later date—though probably the figures we have are only the continuance of a long series of judicial butchery.

The executions for witchcraft in the Vaud were in

1591	8
1592	12
1593	16
1594	9
1595	11
1596	39
1597	65
1598	39
1599	77
1600	35
	311 in ten years

Then, June 19, 1600, the authorities (of Bern, to which the Vaud belonged) issued a decree forbidding the imprisonment of any one unless he had been denounced in three different processes, also limiting greatly the use of torture and curtailing the profits of the officials. In spite of this, in the ten years

1601–10 there were 240 condemnations. Then came a new restrictive decree from Bern of November 20, 1609, yet in 1613 there were 60 and in 1616 75 cases. Fifty years later matters had not much improved, for in 1665 there were 24 executions.—Nippold, Wiederbelebung des Hexenglaubens (Berlin, 1875, p. 79).

The Zwinglians (like the Melanchthonic Lutherans of Hesse) were long in yielding to the craze, of which Bern is a good example. Throughout the sixteenth century it prescribed the utmost caution in such matters. In the Catholic district of Waadt, which it conquered, witch-prosecution was in full swing after 1540. Against this Bern for half a century labored energetically; it ordered all processes to be submitted to its court; it limited the use of torture and twice revised the procedure, the second time in 1600. Satan is a deceiver and presents the appearances of those whom he wishes to destroy; if people of good character are accused, it is to be treated as an illusion; with those of evil reputation, thorough investigation is to be made and the orders of the government are to be awaited. In the Protestant portion of the canton, the first execution occurred in 1571; in the Catholic portion there were 56 between 1591 and 1595, and 255 from 1595 to 1600. The revision of 1600 worked well and the annual number in 1610 fell to 5, but in 1613 it rose to 60 and in 1616 to 75; in the district of Chillon there were 27 in four months.—Längin, Religion und Hexenprozess, pp. 243–44.

Calvin's stern morality and literal adherence to Scripture led him to interpret and put in force the Mosaic decrees against sorcery with ruthless vigor. A pestilence in Geneva in 1542 was attributed to it, and full belief was entertained in pacts with Satan. On these charges in 1545 the gaols were filled with men and women, whose trials were conducted in the cruellest manner. Tearing with red-hot pincers and other newly invented forms of torture were used unsparingly, and those who would not confess were walled up to perish. Many died under torture, others committed suicide. From February 17 to May 15, 1545, there were 34 executions—some of them in savage fashion.—Ib., pp. 245–6.

In Basel, thanks to the theological and legal faculty of the university, in the whole seventeenth century there was but one execution for witchcraft and after 1643 the use of torture was forbidden. In the German-speaking canton of

Bern there was persecution, but the authorities sought to moderate the zeal of their French subjects in the Vaud. In French Switzerland there was much more fanaticism, especially in Geneva. Del Rio says that at one time there were 500 executions in three months at Geneva (Del Rio, Disq. Mag., Proloq.[1] He borrows this from Danaeus—H. C. L.).—Carl Meyer, Der Aberglaube des Mittelalters, p. 327.

The democratic cantons were later than the aristocratic in outgrowing witchcraft, and a woman was executed in Glarus in 1782.—Ib., p. 336.

During Calvin's predominance in Geneva we are told that within a few months there were 34 executions for witchcraft there.—Leitschuh, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hexenwesens in Franken, p. 12.

The latest execution for witchcraft in Geneva is said to have taken place in April, 1652. The victim was a woman named Michea Chauderon—evidently of a very low order of intellect. She was accused of having sent demons to possess Pernette Guillermet and the daughter of Christophe Valins, while eating food with them, and of making Jean Barlod sick by touching his arm—also the children of Suzanne Malbosson. She denied it through one torture; a second infliction brought a partial confession, and when bound in the chair for a third she confessed freely, including the special cases ascribed to her; but her confessions were wandering and contradictory, composed at the moment to satisfy the exigencies of her examiners, while she had not wit enough to construct a consistent story. She was condemned to be strangled and burnt. —Hauber, Bibl. Mag., II, pp. 631–8.[2]

The most interesting feature of this case is the search made for the witch-mark. After her examination and denial, two surgeons, Noel and Thabuys, were called in, who reported that they had found the mark, the size of a lentil, under the right breast, into which they had thrust a needle a finger-length without drawing blood or causing pain. Apparently this was not deemed conclusive, and the next day the two surgeons were adjoined to a third one, Dentand, and two physicians, D'Aubigné and Le Clerc. On pricking the spot

[1] Del Rio does say this (near the end of his Proloquium) and he seems to say that Crespet imputes it to Daneau. But this is not what Crespet imputes to Daneau, and later study has shown it a myth. See Hansen, *Zauberwahn*, p. 505; *Quellen*, p. 607; and my *New England's Place*, p. 15.—B.

[2] On this last Genevan burning see also the monograph of Dr. Paul Ladame, Paris, 1888.

a little blood followed and some pain—it was more sensitive on the left side than on the right. Then they found another spot on the right side of the neck, into which they plunged a needle for a finger-breadth. They concluded that there was something unusual in both spots, but not wholly similar to those commonly found on the bodies of witches. Twelve days later, after an unsuccessful torture, there was a third hunt for the witch-mark, this time by Dr. Puerary and two surgeons, Bernard and Brigant, who reported that the spot under the right breast was not like a devil-mark, but they had found two others which they held to be such, as they could not be explained by any natural cause. One was over the upper lip and the other on the right thigh; both were blackish yellow and like a lentil; with some difficulty they had thrust a needle in each a finger-length without drawing blood or causing pain. This seems to have proved satisfactory, and the accused in her confession admitted the one on the lip, which she said the demon had made with a cobbler's awl, also the one on the right breast, but she knew nothing about those on the neck and the thigh.—Ib., pp. 632–5.

This shows the importance attached to the witch-mark and the sort of evidence that was accepted in witch-trials.

In October of this same year, 1652, a woman of eighty-two, named Nicole de Rosset, was arrested for witchcraft. Various persons testified that she had sent demons to possess them or had made them sick. On October 27 she was examined for the witch-mark by two doctors, Le Clerc and Bonnet, and two surgeons, Noel and Thabuys, who reported that in her pudenda they had found an unnatural and truly suspicious mark. Forty years before, in 1612, she had been tried for the same cause, when the doctor Moise Vuillet had found the same spot and declared that it was from the devil. She was twice tortured, in spite of her age, without confessing, and was sentenced to perpetual exile, but died in prison, doubtless in consequence of the torture.—Ib., pp. 639–40.

Evidently only her endurance saved her from the stake, though we may hope that some consideration for her advanced age led the judges to lighten the torture and to spare her a third or further infliction.

South German Lands.

Riezler, Sigmund.—*Geschichte der Hexenprozesse in Bayern.* Stuttgart, 1896.

The general and special instructions for witch-trials in 1622

direct that during the imprisonment spiritual things, such as holy water, crucifixes, sacred images, Agnus Dei, etc., shall be kept ready so as to overcome the power of the devil. It follows the prescriptions of the Mall. Malef. (P. III, q. 15) as to the means of overcoming taciturnity. In trials at Moosburg and Freising in 1721 and 1722, the torture chamber was filled with incense, the rods used to scourge the accused were blessed, at every audience blessed candles were lighted and relics were given to the accused to overcome the power of sorcery.—Riezler, p. 49.

In the Slavic nations under the Eastern Church the old heathen popular superstitions of witchcraft were as general as in western Europe, but there are no witch trials that approach the western ones. This is explained by the fact that the witch-craze arose after the separation of the Churches and in the East there was no central Church authority to give spiritual confirmation of the belief and enforce its prosecution.—Ib., p. 51.

A great impulse to persecution was given by the appearance of the "Layenspiegel"—a handbook of law by Ulrich Tengler, Landvogt of Höchenstädt a. d. Donau. The first edition appeared in Augsburg, 1509. It was one of 1511 in which the section on witchcraft was enlarged. The book went through many editions during the next half-century and exercised a powerful influence. As regards this subject, it drew its inspiration from the Mall. Malef. In this the authors had ordered judges, whether secular or ecclesiastical, to issue edicts like the Edict of Faith, calling for denunciations under penalties (P. III, q. 1, ed. 1580, pp. 466–8). So in the Layenspiegel the judge is ordered to issue an edict reciting that reports have reached him of the existence of witches in the district, injuring persons and property. All cognizant of such offences are summoned to denounce them within twelve days; if their accusations are not proved they need fear no punishment or responsibility, but all who do not obey the command will be punished.—Ib., pp. 132–5.

The effect of such proclamations can readily be conceived.

The accused is not to be allowed to see the witnesses; she is to be shaved all over and the trial goes on as prescribed in the Mall. Malef.—Ib., pp. 135–6.

Still, in the Bavarian legislation of 1514, 1516, 1553, witchcraft leading to injuries is classed among the graver crimes,

requiring corporal punishment or death, but can be commuted to fines.—Ib., p. 137.

The provisions of the Carolina on the subject are based upon the Bamberg criminal code of 1507, drawn up by Freiherr Johann von Schwarzenberg, a man fully imbued with belief in the influence of the devil. He became an earnest supporter of Luther.—Ib., pp. 137–8.

The Carolina seems for awhile to have been ignored in Bavaria. There is no reference to it in Andreas Perneder's Halsgerichtsordnung, which appeared in 1544 and was frequently reprinted—at least until 1573. It provides burning for those who work evil through sorcery, but cures effected by such means or protection of fields from tempests are not to be punished.—Ib., pp. 139–40.

The German records of the time are fragmentary, but it would appear that during the first half of the sixteenth century there was comparatively little persecution of witchcraft. There were no editions of the Mall. Malef. between 1520 and 1580. In Geneva, from 1542 to 1546, however, there were 800 or 900 arrests and many executions. In Bohemia the first authentic cases occur in 1540 and the following years at Nachod; after 1579 there were numerous burnings at Komotau. In Luzerne, between 1562 and 1572, there were 491 arrests and 62 executions. In the county of Helfenstein, Bavaria (then Protestant), in 1562 and 1563 there were 63 witches burnt, who had killed 29 adults and 208 children, besides 66 horses, and inflicted sickness on 94 persons. In Canton Bern, from 1569 on, the cases were numerous and almost constant. In 1570 at Schlettstadt (Protestant) in Alsace 4 witches were burnt and 1 died in prison; after this the burnings in Alsace were numerous at Tann, from 1572 to 1620, there were 136. In the Mainz Electorate cases occur from 1570 on and become numerous towards the end of the century. In Freiburg (Baden) from 1579 to 1611 there were 34 burnings. August 29, 1582, at Darmstadt 10 witches burnt.

1582, October 19, at Reute (Breisgau), 38 witches burnt, among them 4 midwives and 12 wealthy women.

1582, October 24, at Mompelgard (Württemberg), 44 women and 4 men burnt.

1582, October 28, Türkheim (Alsace), 36 witches burnt, of whom 2 were midwives. A few days later 6 more arrested.

1582, from this time on in the Electorate of Trèves the

burnings were numerous and constant. Out of about 27 villages near Trèves, there were 368 [306] burnt.

1589–92, in Schongau (Bavaria), 63 burnings.

1589–90, in Werdenfels (Freisingen), 51 burnings.

1590, August 1 to May 13, 1592, 68 burnings of witches from Oberdorf and the neighboring villages (diocese of Augsburg).

1590–94, Nördlingen (Protestant), Bavaria, numerous burnings.

1590, Ellingen (Teutonic Order Commandery), 68 executions.

1590, Spalt, 12 burnings.

1591, Wallerstein (Baireuth), 22 burnings.

1591, Nürnberg, 8 executions.

1591–1600, Canton Bern, more than 300 executions.

1591, Kaufbeuren (Bavaria), 7 burnings.

1592, Schwabach (Bavaria), 7 burnings.—Riezler, pp. 141–6.

In Bavaria, though much may lie hidden in the archives, from what is known it would appear that up to 1578 there was little persecution of witchcraft. The clergy were for the most part worldly, ignorant and sensual, not given to dogmatism or fanaticism and not inclined to thunder against the devil. Even after the coming of the Jesuits and the epidemic rage against witchcraft the secular clergy until later times seems to have taken little part in it.—Ib., p. 147.

The Jesuits were unpopular and it was some decades before they felt themselves in position to introduce too many novelties. In 1590, however, a document of the theologians and jurists of Ingolstadt, drawn up under Jesuit influence, was the signal for the propagation of witch-burning in Bavaria.—Ib., p. 148.

There sprang up a popular literature which did much to spread the belief. In 1565, Duke Albrecht V of Bavaria ordered the suppression of all the recent tracts carrying in their titles the name of the devil—such as *Hosenteufel, Spielteufel, Hausteufel, Tanzteufel, Saufteufel,* etc.—on the ground that they served to extend the devil's kingdom. In one of these, however, *Der Teufel selbs,* by Jodok Hocker, a Lutheran preacher, while he ascribes great earthly power to the devil, still, under Weyer's influence, he speaks of the Sabbat and witches' flight as ancient lies and ascribes incubi and succubi and the birth of changelings to deception of the persons involved.—Ib., p. 160.

Both a result and a cause of this was the story of Dr. Faust, the first edition of which appeared in 1587 and speedily became immensely popular. It was a Protestant book, as appears from the passage about "dem gottlosen Unwesen des Papstes und seines Geschmeisses." Its hero was Dr. Georg Faust, a renowned diviner and astrologer who died about 1537 in the "Herrschaft" Staufen, Breisgau. He was a practitioner of white magic, but popular tradition ascribed to him dealings with the devil, who ultimately carried him off.—Ib., pp. 161–2.

The Faust-book makes him sign himself to the devil with his blood, fly through the air, have intercourse with seven succubi; and his other traits represent the popular beliefs of the period.—Ib., p. 163.

In Bavaria witch prosecutions begin to appear in the last years of Albrecht V (†1579). Thus Barbara Beyrlin is arrested in 1578 and the same year Margarete Schilherin is sentenced to burning. She had killed 22 persons and 26 cattle and caused ten tempests.—Ib., p. 164.

The epidemic raged in Bavaria through the reigns of its two most pious princes, Wilhelm V (1579–98) and Maximilian I (1598–1651).—Ib., p. 165.

In Schongau one or two cases called attention to the subject and in 1589 Duke Ferdinand (to whom his brother Wilhelm had given Schongau) ordered a general inquisition. It lasted three years, to the exclusion of all other judicial proceedings, and resulted in the beheading and burning of 63 women, besides the burning of one who had strangled herself in prison. Another had died in prison and her confessor endeavored to prevent the burning of her body because she had retracted her confession, but the Hofrat of Munich rebuked him sharply.—Ib., p. 166.

In all cases the Hofrat had to be consulted, and in one of these its decision was that the woman was to be further tortured continuously till a confession was obtained.—Ib., p. 167.

Herwart, one of those concerned in this business, reported to Duke Ferdinand that many of the women at their execution loudly thanked God that the authorities had so zealously investigated their secret sins. He says that for three years neither men nor cattle had suffered injuries, and he urged that a monument be erected to perpetuate the memory of so unexampled an act of justice.—Ib., p. 168.

Binsfeld's book appeared in 1589 and passed through many editions. A German translation was published in Munich in

1591 and excited so much attention that a second edition was required the next year.—Ib., p. 171.

Jörg Abriel, the executioner at Schongau, became the most influential man in Bavaria as to witchcraft. His experience there as to the witch-mark led him to be called in everywhere, and he rode around in state with his wife and two servants, pricking the accused, and determining whether they should be tortured. On one occasion he could not find the mark, but said that the woman had the look of a witch; and this sufficed, for she was brought to confess by the threat of torture.—Ib., p. 172.

A worthy predecessor of Matthew Hopkins.

Abriel's unskilfulness in beheading a man named Bölki, condemned for murder, led to a shocking scene, and the Landrichter Poissl in consequence cut down his pay. Abriel threatened to be even with him and Poissl notified the authorities of Freising, which decided to satisfy Abriel in order to avoid consequences. On one occasion, unable to find the mark, he said that it sometimes appeared and disappeared, so that repeated examinations were necessary. This led the Freising court to enquire of the Ingolstadt faculty, which replied that the executioner might deceive himself and others and that the mark did not justify torture unless there were other proofs. These, however, were never lacking. At Freising, after a hailstorm, a woman remarked that worse weather might be expected. This sufficed for her arrest and torture, when she confessed and denounced a number, leading to an ever-widening circle. The first arrests comprised 11 women, some of them wives of citizens of Freising and one the mother of the priest of St. Beit.—Ib., pp. 173–4.

A witch-craze in the Alpine district of Werdenfels, from February 5, 1590, to November, 1591, resulted in the execution (some strangled before burning and some not) of 49 women, besides one who committed suicide in prison, and the husband of one, Simon Krembscher, who, after being thrice tortured, confessed and was broken on the wheel.—Ib., p. 178.

The expense of all this was too great for so poor a district to pay. The whole cost was about 4000 florins. The first auto de fe cost 794 fl. 19½ kr. The executioner was paid 2 florins for each examination of the mark, whether he found one or not, and 8 fl. for each execution.—Ib., p. 180.

The whole population was only 4700, all united together by intermarriages so that there were few families unaffected, especially as women of all classes were involved.—Ib., p. 182.

Poissl, the special judge, finally grew tired of the work and January 18, 1592, wrote to the authorities at Freising asking that the prosecutions should cease; if all those denounced were treated as the others more than half the women of the district would be brought under suspicion and have to be tortured, which would be the destruction of the land. He had not prisons to hold the accused or money to pay the torturers and executioners—so the witch-craze came to an end, to the great relief of the population, which had besieged the Freising authorities with petitions to put an end to it.—Ib., pp. 184–5.

In this case the witch-craze was in the government and not in the people.

On April 2, 1590, Duke Wilhelm V called upon his Hofrat and the theological and juridical faculties of Ingolstadt for advice as to the extirpation of witchcraft, for which he was resolved to employ all means.—Ib., p. 187.

The reply from Ingolstadt was prompt. It is dated April 28, and stated that as the matter was novel for the Bavarian judges they should study the processes in Augsburg and Eichstätt and especially the Mall. Malef. and Binsfeld's book. The duke should issue a mandate commanding all suspected of witchcraft to be denounced. For its recognition, Bodin, Bart. Spina and Binsfeld are recommended. The witch-mark is an ordinary sign, also when a woman threatens another with evil that follows. Torture is to be used sooner in these cases than in others and any variations or contradictions by the accused suffice for it. Among the theologians signing this was Gregory of Valencia, the foremost Jesuit theologian of the time.—Ib., p. 188.

Jesuit influence contributed largely to inflame persecution. The Company was constantly growing in power and its members were sought for as confessors by rulers. The General, Aquaviva, in 1589, wrote to the Rhenish Provincial that its members might advise rulers to take measures against the witchcrafts, which were said to be numerous in Germany and should, on occasion, tell witches that their duty, when questioned by judges, was to name all their accomplices. (Quoted from Janssen-Pastor, VIII, p. 654, q. v.)—Ib., p. 190.

Already in 1563 Peter Canisius had written to Lainez about

the great increase of witches, against whom prosecutions were everywhere going on, and had given accounts of their eating children and of other absurdities attributed to them.—Ib., p. 190.

Jeremiah Drexel, the great preacher of the Order, who for twenty-three years was court-preacher to Duke Maximilian I, fiercely urged the extermination of witches, as the command of God, and declared that those who opposed the persecution were unworthy the name of Christians.—Ib., pp. 190–1.

Maximilian I was as earnest as his father in this matter. Laborious, sagacious and clear-headed in other respects, he had in this been trained by his tutor, the theologian Johann Baptist Fickler, who was a zealous persecutor, and in 1582 had drawn up a "Judicium generale de poenis maleficarum," in which he presented the extreme inquisitorial position.[1]—Ib., p. 194.

When only seventeen years old, at Ingolstadt in 1589 and 1590, he [Maximilian] had taken part in witch trials, had been present at the torture and wrote to his father that soon there would be five ready for the fire.—Ib., p. 195.

Under such training Maximilian became the most vigorous witch persecutor of the Bavarian princes. He had a personal interest in it, moreover, for the barrenness of his first wife, Elisabeth, was ascribed to sorcery by Michael Marrano, the Barnabite General, an experienced man in such things, as he was largely sought after by princes to unbewitch them—many of them at that time believing themselves to be bewitched, among them Emperor Rudolf II and his brother and successor Matthias.—Ib., p. 196.

In Munich, in 1600, 8 men and 3 women were executed. Six of them on the way to execution were torn six times with red-hot pincers, 1 woman had her breasts cut off, 5 men were broken on the wheel, 1 man was impaled and finally all were burnt alive.—Ib., pp. 198–9.

This ferocity was equalled by that of the trials. Among those denounced by the above victims were 21 persons prosecuted at Tettenwang. Among these were a family of unspotted reputation. The father died in prison. The mother was hoisted in the strappado eleven times and then confessed all that was wanted. The daughter Agnes, a girl of twenty, was

[1] It is preserved in MS. in the Munich Staatsbibliothek, bound with his copy of Spina's *Novus Malleus Maleficarum*. See art. on Fickler in the *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie*.

hoisted on August 11 eleven times, ten of them with a 50-pound weight. She bore it heroically, confessing nothing and pardoning those who had falsely accused her. Ten weeks later, on October 20, after there had been time to cure her, she was tortured again. After four hoistings she was told that her mother had accused her; her courage gave way, she screamed and said that, if her mother said so, she would admit it and with this she fell to the floor in convulsions. Four days later she made an unsuccessful attempt at suicide, and after this she told monstrous tales of herself—how she had had intercourse with the devil since she was eight years old, had killed numbers of children, 30 of whose hearts she ate, killed 8 old people by smearing them with ointment, raised 5 tempests, killed numerous cattle, been constantly to the Sabbat, renounced God and so forth. Both she and her mother were burnt, and she with others, to their confessors, withdrew their confessions and denunciations of others.—Ib., pp. 199–201.

It can readily be seen how few would escape when once on trial.

In 1608 at Munich a peasant woman was accused of having raised a storm. The judges admitted that she was feeble-minded—not furious, but merely simple. Still she was tortured severely four times and then left in prison for eight months till she killed herself.—Ib., p. 202.

Duke Maximilian attempted to stimulate the persecution by getting the spiritual authorities to join the secular courts in the work. At his request Clement VIII, May 4, 1604, empowered for three years a number of church dignitaries to proceed against witches, but there is no evidence of their activity in this direction.—Ib., p. 204.

February 12, 1611, Duke Maximilian issued a comprehensive edict against sorcery and witchcraft, embracing all the popular superstitions as well as the black arts. As regards witchcraft, all calling upon or praying to the devil entailed burning alive; if indirect, beheading first. If evil had been wrought on men, beasts or harvests, there was to be tearing with red-hot pincers before burning. Instructions for procedure prescribed free use of torture.—Ib., pp. 208–11.

In Maximilian's great legislation of 1616, heresy and witchcraft are privileged and not subject to the general rule that the accused is not to be arrested and tortured unless there is a *corpus delicti*. In torture accomplices may be inquired

after, but not special individuals. If confession is retracted torture can be repeated and, if the indications are strong, a third time. It can be repeated also if new proofs are received. Torture *in caput alienum* does not count among the direct tortures. All confessions and concluded processes are to be sent to the higher authorities and their instructions awaited. When the evil wrought is not great, or the culprit shows true repentance, the judge may order strangling before burning.—Ib., pp. 212–13.

Maximilian urged his judges to greater activity in the detection and punishment of witchcraft. A printed instruction to this effect was circulated in 1612 and in 1625 he recalled this to the attention of the authorities of Landshut. When, in 1619, the Ingolstadt stadtholder wanted to abandon a case against three women and three children on account of defective evidence, Maximilian took it out of his hands and gave it to the burgomaster and council of the town.—Ib., p. 214.

Dissatisfied with the dilatoriness of the magistrates of Munich in the case of an insane woman, he consulted his chancellor, who advised him to evoke the case to himself. There is no date to this, but it may have impelled him to the general and special "Instruction on Witchcraft" of 1622, which is perhaps the most mischievous of all utterances on the subject. It is based on the Mall. Malef. and Binsfeld, reciting all the evils of witches, even to their turning themselves into wild beasts. It requires all officials to order their subjects to denounce all suspects, while cautioning them to observe whether this may spring from hatred and whether the accused are persons in good standing. A formula of interrogations was presented as a model. The denunciation of others by a witch under torture sufficed for their arrest, but if there is no other evidence they are to be only threatened with torture. Torture requires three denouncers or the evidence of an accuser corroborated by a trustworthy person, though in witchcraft less evidence for it is required than in other crimes, and it suffices that the accused is variable and fearful. The denunciations of pretended diviners and informers do not justify arrest. The judge is not to secure confession by false promises of pardon and the cold-water and hot-iron ordeals are forbidden as superstitious. The procedure is to be in accordance with law and not too hurried. Advocates were admitted. If no confession is obtained the accused is not to be condemned, unless the proofs admit of no doubt,

and then the punishment is to be somewhat lightened. After confession she is not to be confined alone, but to have cell companions to prevent despair (suicide). Revocation of confession is not permitted, as otherwise these cases would never come to an end. To those who persist in denial the sacrament is to be refused. Priests are not to be admitted to the condemned except to receive confessions; they are not to talk with them in private nor give them opportunity of revocation. To prevent the suicide of despair, the condemned were to be strangled before burning—though the judges had discretion to order burning alive for cause, and persistent assertion of innocence was sufficient cause. There is no allusion to sending the papers to the higher authorities, but there is a provision that before execution the judges shall consult the universities or other jurists.—Ib., pp. 215–19.

Under such impulsion as this little villages saw witches burnt by the dozen and after an interval a new outcry would arise. A special commissioner would be sent and ask a number of inhabitants whom they suspected, when almost every one would accuse his neighbors on the most frivolous grounds, showing how completely the idea of witchcraft possessed all minds, how all misfortunes were attributed to it and also how when any one was more successful or fortunate than his fellows his success showed him to be a sorcerer.—Ib., pp. 219–20.

The Jesuit Johann Reichard was a victim. He had been a teacher in Eichstätt and then pastor of the church of Our Lady in Ingolstadt. A girl whom he had seduced was executed for witchcraft, with all the signs of true repentance. She accused him as an accomplice in 1625. He was thrice tortured without confession and could neither be condemned nor acquitted, so he lingered in gaol apparently until 1644, when he died.—Ib., p. 221.

Eichstätt had witch persecutions with numerous executions in 1590, 1603–30 and 1637. From 1603 to August 20, 1627, there were 122 executions for witchcraft, among them only 9 men. Persons of the upper class were included; strangling usually preceded burning, though not always; some were torn with pincers and one had the right hand cut off.—Ib., pp. 221–3.

Johann Christoph, Bishop of Eichstätt, a sharp persecutor of witches, issued an order, December 11, 1627, stating that, although he had a right to the estates of the culprits, he had resolved on a milder course in order that it might be under-

stood that the prosecutions were solely for the honor of God, the protection of the people and the administration of justice. —Ib., pp. 225–6.

About 1629 an Eichstätt judge reports that up to that time he had examined 274 witches "who have to all appearance died" (been put to death?—H. C. L.).—Ib., p. 226.

Bear in mind that the prince-bishops—such as he of Eichstätt, or of Freising—had jurisdiction.

Anna Käserin, who was beheaded at Neuburg September 29, 1629, had said to her confessor that her confession was extorted by torture and that she and all whom she had accused were innocent. The priest reported this to the commissioners, but the only result was that she was tortured more severely than before.[1]—Ib., p. 228.

The persecution was all-pervading and every place had its list of victims. In the little village of Reichertshofen a list (of about the middle of the seventeenth century) of those executed up to that time amounts to 50.—Ib., p. 229.

Johann Zink, in 1549, wrote an essay, *De potestate daemonum, maleficarum et sagarum*, which his disciple Johann Waltenberger subsequently copied and dedicated to Cardinal Bishop Otto of Augsburg (apparently never printed—exists only in manuscript—H. C. L.). He took the ground that the flight of witches, their transformation into beasts and eating children were illusions. Many honest men through zeal wish to burn them, but there are just as many who regard them with compassion, protect them and say they can injure no one. Zink himself holds that burning is justifiable only when they have had sexual relations with the demon; if this were forgiven, every place would be full of them.—Ib., pp. 233–4.

The Protestant Reinhard Lutz, of Schlettstadt (apparently pastor there), felt obliged to justify the burning of witches there in 1570, as many called it in question and considered all to be fables and imagination.—Ib., p. 234.

The Ingolstadt priest Hektor Wegman, in 1574, was led to print 95 theses on witchcraft because in these unfortunate times there were too many supporters of profane novelties who could not distinguish between magic and non-magic.—Ib., p. 234.

The persecution was by no means confined to peasants and

[1] For much more on this case see below (pp. 1137–40). Pfalz-Neuburg, to which it belongs, had in 1504 been created out of Bavarian territory.

the lowest class. Everyone had reason to dread it and the Eichstätt episcopal authorities said openly that the doctors of Ingolstadt were opposed to it because they feared for their wives.—Ib., p. 237.

Naturally the victims under torture were reckless as to whom they accused.

Riezler says that there was in Electoral Bavaria a strong undercurrent of opposition to the persecution which rendered it less destructive there than elsewhere in Germany in spite of the urgency of Maximilian.—Ib., p. 239.

It was especially in the territories of the prince-bishops of Germany that the persecution was the cruelest. In Würzburg under Bishop Philipp Adolf von Ehrenberg (1623–31) there were 900 burnings, including persons of high standing. So it was in Trèves, Strassburg, Fulda and Bamberg. In the principality of Neisse, which belonged to the Bishop of Breslau, the persecution was great—thus in Zuckmantel within a year there were 58 burnt; in Freiwaldau altogether 102, and among them many Ratsfrauen. Protestant territories were not behind them—Brunswick, Nassau, Hesse Cassel, Kursachsen (where the Leipzig professor Carpzov, †1666, exercised his authority) and the Saxon principalities.—Ib., pp. 240–1.

Riezler estimates that a moderate computation of the executions in secular Bavaria, from the sixteenth century to 1756, is between 1000 and 2000. In the bishoprics of Freising, Augsburg and Eichstätt together (Riezler calls them episcopal enclaves) the number could not have been less. As to the bishoprics of Passau and Regensburg, nothing is known, except occasional references to executions there.—Ib., pp. 241–2.

Riezler ascribes to Tanner's writings an influence shown in a decree of Maximilian I, January 12, 1631, stating that in Munich there were many persons imprisoned on accusations of witchcraft. The prescriptions of the Carolina are to be rigidly enforced without distinction of persons; but, as he understands that some of these show repentance and desire to return to God, it is ordered that those who spontaneously confess to a commissioner appointed *ad hoc* and denounce all witches known to them shall be pardoned and their names kept secret. But those who do not thus come forward shall be rigidly prosecuted with torture and be executed.—Ib., pp. 266–7.

This is a sort of Edict of Grace. Riezler assumes that it applies to the prisoners, but it is evidently intended to bring forward penitents unknown.

Riezler says that this ends the period of sharpest persecution and that in the following decades to the present time scarce any prosecutions in Bavaria are known.—Ib., p. 267.

In the great pestilence of 1634 there was no ascribing it to witchcraft. But the chief cause of the change would seem to be the war, which left men no leisure to think about witches. It had begun with great glory and advantage to Bavaria, but after the appearance on the scene of Gustavus Adolphus (1630–2) there was naught but misery and desolation.—Ib., p. 269.

In Calw (Württemberg), in 1673, there was a great epidemic of witchcraft among children. Riezler alludes also to a large increase in witch prosecutions, especially among children and schoolboys in Bavaria and its bishoprics, and attributes it to the teaching as to witches in the religious instruction of the time.—Ib., pp. 270–1.

When clerical influence maintained its power, legislation remained unchanged. In Bavaria persecution diminished in the latter part of the seventeenth century and the early years of the eighteenth, but from 1715 to 1722 it reached high water mark.—Ib., p. 270.

The Elector Ferdinand Maria in 1665 and Maximilian III Joseph (*sic*) in 1746 issued decrees against witchcraft, which are copied almost literally from that of Maximilian I in 1611. —Ib., p. 272.

In 1709 the Tyrolese Frölich v. Frölichsburg, the most highly esteemed commentator on the criminal law—while admitting that of old many innocent persons suffered and many guilty ones escaped—boasts that now the matter is so well understood that no innocent person can be convicted. His views on the subject are those of the Mall. Malef. and he accepts the Sabbat, incubi and succubi, transformation into animals, storm raising, etc.—Ib., p. 272.

The criminal code of 1751 provides burning alive for witchcraft and sorcery, commerce with incubi, worship of the devil and dishonoring the sacrament; beheading for pact with the demon and conjurations to damage life, health or reason of men or cattle, fruits, etc. Magic arts which do not injure entail prison, scourging, exile, public penance, according to degree of guilt. But the judges are ordered to proceed with great caution and moderation and not to accept as witch-

craft all that seems inexplicable to weak human understanding or to accept the confessions of witches and their accusations of accomplices.—Ib., pp. 273–4.

This code was the work of the enlightened Chancellor von Kreittmayr, who, in a commentary on it issued anonymously in 1752, gives the impression that he did not accept the reality of witchcraft without doubts. Riezler explains the severity of the code by the necessity which he felt of not opposing the opinions of the powerful clergy.—Ib., p. 275.

In his commentary he prescribes examining and shaving the whole body as a remedy for *maleficium taciturnitatis*—as of old.—Ib., p. 278.

Torture was the chief source of witchcraft conviction and of prolonging the belief. It was abolished in Prussia in 1740, in Baden in 1767, in Saxony in 1770 and in Austria in 1776. How long it continued in Bavaria Riezler does not say, but he quotes an order in 1779 limiting its use to extraordinary and exceptional cases.—Ib., p. 278.

In 1722 there was an execution for lycanthropy in Salzburg (Austria).—Ib., p. 279.

January 9, 1666, at Munich a seventy-year-old man was executed. The only charge against him was making storms; and, "though he deserved much severer punishment," by the grace of the Elector he was torn with red-hot pincers on both arms and the right breast, tied to a stake and burnt. He was said to have fallen naked on the ground from a cloud.—Ib., p. 285.

There was in Salzburg from 1677 to 1681 a great prosecution against at least 100 persons—mostly young, from five years upwards, beggars and people of the lowest class. February 22, 1679, there were 7 executed. In 1678–9 there were 76 executions, beheading, strangling and burning, the youngest ten years old, the oldest eighty. Doubtless all were executed, for torture was freely used. The number of prisoners was so great that a special gaol had to be built.—Ib., pp. 285–6.

At Geisling in 1689 there was a witch epidemic. More than 20 were tried, most of whom were executed, but of them 4 young children were taken to see their parents executed and then were scourged with rods. This was criticised as excessive leniency, for there was no hope of their reformation, as they had had commerce with demons while in prison.—Ib., pp. 286–7.

Report (1715) as to the means of overcoming the *maleficium taciturnitatis*: Before the torture, shaving all over and administering a drink composed of various ingredients, including holy water and oil of turpentine. Then follows a description of successive tortures lasting for three days—the girdle with pricks, scourging with rods, the rack, burning, etc.—Ib., pp. 288–9.

At Dingolfing, Walburga Pillering is beheaded and burnt for the customary performances of witchcraft. Her two sons, aged nine and twelve, whom she had given to the devil and who had gone to the Sabbat, were to be made to see their mother's execution and be soundly whipped, then kept in custody to give them Christian training.—Ib., p. 289.

At Freising, in 1717, 3 men beheaded and burnt for commerce with incubi, attending Sabbat, etc. One other had killed himself in prison. Two boys made to witness the execution, then scourged and delivered to their parents.—Ib., p. 290.

At Wasserburg, 1715, Caspar Schwaiger, a schoolmaster, accused by 9 of his schoolboys, confesses to same practices. Record imperfect.—Ib., p. 290.

Schwaiger and the schoolboys inculpated Johann Endtgrueber, a gardener at Erding. He endured the severest torture without confession. [When brought a second time to the torture chamber he made full confession,] then revoked, but when threatened with repetition withdrew his revocation. Beheaded and burnt.—Ib., pp. 291–2.

In 1717 the Salzburg court condemns 5 men for lycanthropy to nine years of galleys and they were delivered to the Venetians. They used an ointment to convert themselves into wolves and had killed over 200 head of cattle.—Ib., p. 293.

In 1720 the same court condemns to beheading and burning Simon Windt for lycanthropy. He dies thanking the archbishop for the mercy of beheading.—Ib., p. 293.

At Moosburg, in 1722, Georg Pröls is convicted on the evidence of some boys. He had confessed under severe torture and then revoked. Condemned to beheading and burning; confirmed by the Landshut authorities and executed. The Landshut people, however, were frightened at the extent to which the case was spreading and ordered the absolution and discharge of 13 others involved in it, some of whom had confessed.—Ib., p. 294.

Freising, 1721–22. Twenty-two persons prosecuted, of

whom 11 were executed. Among these were a boy of thirteen, 3 of fourteen and 1 each of sixteen, seventeen and eighteen. All males but 2 women. Besides these, there were 3 women (2 of them mothers of executed boys) sent to Burgrain for further trial.—Ib., p. 295.

Observe in all these modern cases the preponderance of men.

Eichstätt, 1723. Maria Walburga Rung, a girl of twenty-two. She had been tried at Mannheim (Pfalzneuburg), when the judge pronounced that she was a loose woman, but the accusation of witchcraft had no foundation. When she fell, however, in the hands of the episcopal court of Eichstätt, torture brought the desired confession and she was beheaded and burnt.—Ib., p. 295.

Augsburg, 1728–34. A woman tried for child murder and incest with her brother. The use of torture changes it to witchcraft, in which finally 20 persons are involved. Torture brings confessions and accusations and results in the execution of some of the accused, the scourging, pillorying and exile of others.—Ib., p. 296.

At Landshut, in 1754, Veronika Zerritschin, a girl of thirteen, and in 1756 Maria Klossnerin were burnt as witches —the last cases in Bavaria.—Ib., p. 297. (Riezler quotes this from Buchner, *Gesch. von Bayern*, and has not been able to prove it.—H. C. L.)

An anonymous paper in some periodical, of which the title and date are unluckily not given, presents from the records the trial in Bavaria of a woman named Lucia Geiger, in 1587, which presents some points of interest. The affair took place in Klein Steingaden, the seat of the Premonstratensian Abbey of Steingaden.

In 1575 Hans Nigel, an employee of the Abbey, lost a swine and his six-year-old boy died of smallpox. The boy had injured a goose of Lucia's and she had threatened to take an armload of rods to his father with which to correct him. That same day the boy took to his bed, in fourteen days the smallpox appeared and in four days he died. Nigel accused her of both losses and she was imprisoned, but the cellarer of the Abbey made it up between them at the request of the inhabitants, and she was released with a warning that, if further complaints came, she would not get off so easily.

Twelve years afterwards, in 1587, her next-door neighbor, Michl Strauss, had three horses die on his hands at short

intervals. On skinning them they were all found to be blue and black, with many ulcers. By the advice of the Abbot he accused Lucia of bewitching them to the Gerichtsschreiber of Schongau, who chanced to be there, and she was again arrested by the local authorities and taken to Schongau by order of Philippsen Lidl, Land- und Stadtrichter of the Duke of Bavaria. He examined her; there was no evidence against her except some trivial tattle, and she firmly asserted her innocence. He sent the papers to the high court at Munich with a report in which, without asking for torture, he indicated that she was strongly suspect. The reply ordered the use of holy water, the intervention of a priest to summon her to repentance and confession and then, whether she confesses or not, the application of the thumbscrew and strappado, with warning that, if she persists in denial, torture will be more severely used. She is to be asked under torture whether the devil did not often appear to her and in what form, what he taught her and whether she had not pact with him. Other witnesses are also to be examined. The torture produced no confession. The additional witnesses were examined, without obtaining anything of much importance, and on this new testimony she was tortured again without confessing, but with abundant shrieking, as though she were insane. The protocol was again sent to Munich and produced an order from Duke Ferdinand to discharge her on her taking the *Urphede*.

This shows that in Catholic Bavaria the local courts had no summary or independent jurisdiction. The accused is taken to Schongau to be tried; the trial is merely the taking of testimony and the sentences both of torture and final decision are rendered in Munich on the protocols. There was no unnecessary delay; the arrest was made in the beginning of May and the *Urphede* was sworn to June 12. As yet there seems to have been none of the fierce determination to convict by endless repetition of torture—a single application each time, apparently of no great severity or prolongation, suffices and the failure to extort confession produces discharge.

This moderation, however, was not of long duration. A final remark of the writer tells of 63 women executed in Schongau in 1589, but whether Lucia was included among them is not known.—"Ein Hexenprocess zu Schongau vom Jahre 1587. Aus den Originalacten geschichtlich dargestellt von Rath Her . . ."[1]

[1] An article (pp. 128–44) from an old periodical. Bound with Snell's *Hexenprozesse und Geistesstörung* and other pamphlets. Identified by Riezler (*Hexenprozesse in Bayern*, p. 166) as "Oberbayer—Archiv XI."

The following case indicates the ordinary course of a trial in the year 1629. Ann Käserin was wife of Georg Käser, an innkeeper of Eichstätt, who had recently removed to Rennertshofen, where he had charge of the revenue of the Chapter. There she was arrested in March, 1629, and taken to Neuburg for trial. By command of the Pfalzgraf her house was thoroughly searched for chests, glasses (vials?) and oven-forks, but nothing was found. Orders came to chain her to the wall to prevent escape and a female guard and watcher was appointed. Her husband was ordered to send a bed, which he brings March 19, with a most affectionate letter, expressing his profound grief, asking for instructions how to keep the house—"Bist du, O mein Schatz, schuldig, bekenn es; bist du unschuldig, hast ein gnädige Obrikeit, derer wir zuvorderst Gottes Huld und unsere kleine Kinder zugetrösten."—Snell, Hexenprozesse und Geistesstörung (München, 1891), pp. 42, 45.[1]

The evidence against her was ample from those who testified to seeing her in the Sabbat, some from ten years previous, others more recently, giving ample details as to her acts, her dresses and her demon lovers. From the dates of their executions it is evident that there was no haste in proceeding against the Käserin. The witnesses were Anna Hellmayrin, executed October 10, 1620; Adam Ringer, February 17, 1624; Eva Kasparin, March 13, 1624; Maria Rattingerin, August 3, 1624; Margaretha Pittingerin, November 20, 1626; Walburga Schmidin, December 10, 1626; Margaretha Yelin, December 19, 1626; Barbara Widmänin, March 6, 1627; Barbara Käberin, August 20, 1627; Lorenz Bonschab, December 16, 1627; Apollonia Schiffelholzin, March 18, 1626; and Maria Strobelin on trial (10 women and 2 men—showing that there had been continuous prosecutions, especially in 1626 and 1627).—Ib., pp. 42–4.

Observe there are no accusations of evil deeds—only of attendance at Sabbat.

First audience, March 19, 1629. She denies; had left Eichstätt because she was accused of it; had had 6 children, of whom 5 were living. Meister Jakob, the executioner, was summoned to Neuburg and a second audience was appointed, at which she was threatened that she would be tortured. As

[1] Quoting J. Baader, *Anzeiger des Germanischen Museums*, Bd. XXIII (September, 1876), pp. 259–65.

she persisted in denial, on March 27 further orders came from the ducal court as to the proceedings.

March 21, second audience. The instruments of torture were displayed, she still denied, and persisted through the thumbscrew, declaring the accusation came from hate and envy. When hoisted in the strappado, the torturer said he thought she was light, but he would as lief have hoisted a horse. After hanging for half a quarter of an hour, she begged to be let down and she would confess. She said that the evidence of the witnesses was all true (it must have been read to her—H. C. L.), she had been repeatedly to the Sabbat and to cellars—named persons seen there—her fork was in the kitchen—once when she was drunken and lay down to rest some one came into her room and she abandoned herself to him—this happened twice—then she renounced God and his creatures—her demon lover scratched her and with the blood she signed her name—the scratch is on her right foot—one of her demon lovers was named Beelzebub. Then the executioner was ordered to examine her foot and found the scar, the same, he said, that he had found on other witches. Confession continued: had never injured men—two years ago had killed a cow by driving it with a stick anointed with a salve given her by Barbara Widmännin—also a swine, at the order of the devil—had never helped to kill or eat children—had often knelt and prayed to the devil, but had never spat at or blasphemed the Virgin—she went to the Sabbat about 10 P.M. and returned about 4 A.M.—would anoint the end of the fork and fly away—and would anoint her husband's back so that he would not wake—these salves were given to her by the devil—describes where the pots containing them were hidden in her house—the fork was in the kitchen.—Ib., pp. 45–7.

Dr. Holzfeld was sent to Rennertshofen and found two of the ointment pots but not the third; one was empty and the other had some hard, dry, black substance, the nature of which he could not tell; no fork was found. Then another audience with torture, when she named other accomplices, other cattle killed and how often her demon lover came to her.—Ib., p. 47.

Then her husband was examined. For seven years she had never or very seldom been cheerful, had rarely gone to weddings or other festivities when invited, but had always been

praying, fasting and weeping, often so bitterly that she could have washed her hands; she had spun and managed the household when at home. At Eichstätt she had confessed and communed every fourteen days or at most every four weeks, and then usually spent half the day in the church. He had lost altogether three head of cattle.—Ib., p. 47.

May 30 she had another audience with torture (third time?) and again named various persons seen in the Sabbat. To a question she answered that she had taught the art to no one, especially children. But she had taught her maid, who had accompanied her three or four times to the Sabbat with her demon lover in the shape of a peasant. She had once rubbed a girl's left arm with salve, which sickened her and she died within six months. She had killed one of her children by rubbing its left side with salve, being forced to this by the devil; he had not allowed her to confess oftener, after confession she had not always communed, she had never dishonored the Sacrament, but had no faith in it. Her demon had been with her fourteen days before and charged her not to confess, but to deny, and no hurt would come to her. He came back to her afterwards.—Ib., p. 48.

Three commissioners were sent to Rennertshofen, but found there only a small earthen pot, which she recognized as that of the ointment. Husband again examined and says he lost a small child. Then she is charged with having emptied her bowels and bladder into a bowl, broken bread into it and eaten it, but vomited it. She admits this and says it was in hope of killing herself. She is severely tortured in the strappado with the boot on her legs (fourth time) and names additional accomplices, also that she had caused tempests and had killed a peasant. She had made mists and hail and snails, but not rain. It was done with a powder and black salve, given her by the devil; she would wrap it up in a cloth and cast it up in the air in the devil's name, when the storm would come at once. The devil had been with her that day, coming in through a cranny, clothed like a student. He wanted to take her with him to the Petersberg, but she told him she could not go, as she had chains on her feet. Sometimes he had human hands, sometimes claws, occasionally shoes and spurs; his left foot was a goose foot.—Ib., p. 48.

June 13 she was visited by two priests, one of them a

Jesuit, to whom she said she was innocent; her confessions had been compelled by torture—all of those condemned as witches were innocent and she asked to have this reported to the Commissioners (those conducting the trial were evidently commissioned for the purpose by the superior tribunal —H. C. L.). The result of this was another audience and severer torture than before (the fifth) in which she repeated her former confessions and inculpation of those seen at the Sabbat, with a good many embroideries. The demon came to her almost every night, but she would no more have anything to do with him. She had never made mice. She ended with the prayer that they would burn no one but her and would burn no more in the land. After this audience she was taken to another cell and the wife of old Georg Müller was placed in hers. (Persecution evidently going on.—H. C. L.)—Ib., p. 49.

On September 20, 1629, she was beheaded and burnt.—Ibidem.

Volk, Franz.—*Hexen in der Landvogtei Ortenau und Reichsstadt Offenburg.* Lahr, 1882.

Offenburg, [then a free city of the Empire, now] in Baden, was a Catholic state.

Volk was Bürgermeister in Offenburg and in his researches among the records came across the material for this work. From his Preface it would seem that his chief motive in publication was to offset the existing tendency to a revival of belief in witchcraft.

The earliest document he finds is of July, 1557, when two women were burnt (pp. 5–8). The next is of October 25, when Wolf Lenz was beheaded and burnt and his mother and Margarete Ketter were burnt alive (pp. 8–9).

There seems to have been some humanity as yet, for two women accused by Wolf Lenz, on their husbands' petition and giving security, and in view of their children and pregnancy, were discharged.

June 5, 1573, a woman named Hansin was burnt, who for eighteen years had borne the reputation of a witch. She was accused by three women, recently burnt in the neighboring town of Gengenbach. Her own son was the chief witness again her.—Ib., p. 9.

There was evidently persecution on foot elsewhere.

In 1574 a woman burnt (p. 9).

1575, June 26, Urban Byser was burnt. According to him if 100 witches were assembled to do some misdeed and one among them objected, the rest were powerless, but if all were unanimous, one was selected for its execution. Also, his succubus would change his shape at wish to differently appearing women (p. 10). In July, 1575, Hans Byser and the old Byserin were executed (p. 10).

1595, June 23, 3 women burnt (p. 10). August 11, 3 more—one who at thirteen had been married to a demon who gave her a switch, with a single blow of which she could kill man or beast (p. 11). This seems a common feature of these trials—the death-dealing switch (pp. 12–14). September, 1596, a man burnt (p. 13). October, 1596, a woman (p. 14) and another hangs herself in gaol after confessing (p. 15). In 1599, 5 women and 1 man (p. 15). In 1603, a mother and a daughter (p. 16).

Thus far all the victims seem to be of the lowest class and miserably poor—offering little temptation to greed. Many of them in their confessions state that the demon appears to them first in some moment of despair for lack of means. Others when suffering from the cruelty of their husbands. There were occasional examples of active imagination, which depart from the routine confessions. Thus in 1629 the demon first appears to Barbara, wife of Georg Widmann, in the shape of her husband and then, after a cordial greeting, runs away in the shape of a wolf.—Ib., p. 20.

There is a considerable interval apparently without prosecutions until the seventeenth century is well advanced, when it is resumed with greater destructiveness. In the confessions of this period it is observable that often the connection with the incubus commences with a marriage celebrated with much ceremony and is spoken of as marriage.—Ib., pp. 18–19, 21.

Among the numerous victims between 1627 and 1630, there is no case of lycanthropy alluded to (p. 20).

In 1628 the wife of Jakob Widmer was hoisted in the strappado April 5 and 6. Then the witchmark was searched for and a needle thrust in to the head without pain or blood. This justified continuance and she was hoisted again with a weight. This was repeated the next day and finally on the 8th, after overcoming another torture, she was placed in the chair, when, after three hours of it, she confessed (p. 22).

So far as known, from the imperfect records, the executions for witchcraft in the Landvogtei Ortenau are:

1557.	July	2	
1559.	October 25	3	
1573.	June 5	1	
1574.		1	
1575.	June 26	1	
	July	2	
1595.	June 22	3	
	August 11	3	
	September	1	
1595.	October	2	(suicides)
1599.		3	
	November 5	3	
1603.		3	

After this all but two were first beheaded.

1627.		4	
1628.	January 26	4	
	28	4	
	February	4	
	April	5	
	May 27	4	(2 burnt alive)
	June 21	3	
	July	4	
	August 4	3	
	October 17	3	
1629.	April 4	4	
	May 21	1	
	July 14	1	
	16	2	(1 of these, Katherine Bischler,
	30	1	was tortured 3 times severely
	31	2	without confession, but was
	August	8	condemned)
	November	3	
1630.	May 14	14	

Ib., pp. 23–7.

Thus, in 1628, there were 34 and, in 1629, 22. Whether the persecution continued, he does not say. These cases are in the Landvogtei, and not in the Reichstadt Offenburg, which Volk treats separately and subsequently.

The first case in Offenburg, in the existing records, is in August, 1586, when Schwartze Else was accused. She was twice tortured without confession, whereupon the Rath sen-

tenced her to take the *Urphede*, pay the costs and be banished across the Black Forest.—Ib., p. 32.

The earliest executions were in 1697–9, when 3 women (one the wife of the Rath Laubbach) were burnt and 2 more saved themselves by flight.—Ibidem.

It would seem that here the Rath, or town council, whose members were elected by the guilds, decided as to prosecutions and appointed the judges—usually the Schultheiss and other officials and citizens.—Ib., p. 46.

Bear in mind that Offenburg was a Reichstadt, a free city, and therefore self-governing—not subject to superior jurisdiction. Its procedure is therefore of interest as typical. What was that of the Landvogtei does not appear. However, see below, under 1608, for supreme jurisdiction at Speyer.

The Rath was evidently hesitating and unwilling in these matters, causing dissatisfaction and complaint on the part of citizens, wherefore on October 11, 1600, it issued an edict, asserting that it was not indifferent or partial, in spite of which the dissatisfied were making disturbance. It would hear all cases and execute judgments without cost or risk to the accuser. This only excited the people more and one of the leaders, Jakob Fiegenbach, declared that he would at his own cost, in fourteen days, arrest and cause the burning of a witch. In fact, on November 24, he appeared with Thomas Dreier before the Rath, accusing Christine, wife of Rockenbach, an innkeeper, of having bewitched Dreier in a glass of wine. Then Georg Sprengler and wife accused her of blinding their child. She was arrested and admitted freely that she had to do with the demon *Stumm-pfäfflin*. She was tortured more than once and confessed, but always revoked her confessions, whereupon, December 13, she was discharged, for the reason that this makes the demon give way and the accused is glad to tell the truth.—Ib., pp. 32–3.

She had named as an accomplice Margarete Wannemacher. The jurist Dr. Hartlich of Strassburg, who was consulted, pronounced the evidence too uncertain and groundless for conviction. If stronger evidence came she might be tortured twice, when, if she did not confess, she could be banished. She was discharged, however, January 15, 1601. Already Apollonia, wife of Mathis, had been similarly discharged.—Ib., p. 34.

In 1601 there was disturbance. The families Laubbach and Silberrad were hostile. Georg Laubbach was a member of the Rath; his wife had been burnt as a witch. Ruprecht

Silberrad, a leader of the witch persecutors, September 7, 1601, accused his daughters Adelheid and Helene of killing "his flesh and blood," and his ally Lienhard Stehlin accused Helene of killing his son, on the strength of the assertions of two women in prison. Then on October 31 the arrest of two women grape-thieves gave rise to a further accusation against a third daughter of Laubbach, Else, wife of the baker Gwinner (for her see below). The Rath refused to undertake the matter unless Silberrad would put his accusation in writing, which he declined to do for fear, as he said, of consequences to his boy. His brother Kaspar was a member of the Rath, but that body stood firm, although the affair caused much excitement throughout the town, the guilds being appealed to on both sides. At length the Rath ordered the arrest of Silberrad, Stehlin and three of their principal supporters, Hennert, Baur and Fiegenbach. The latter fled and the others were incarcerated, February 4, 1602, but on the intercession of the church authorities were given their houses as prisons. Apparently the inculpated women escaped trial, but Silberrad and Stehlin obtained a decision for damages in their favor.—Ib., pp. 34–9.

The two grape-stealers above named, were mother and daughter, Eva and Marie Vetter—vagrants apparently without any fixed place of abode. They were caught by Olmüller Weid eating a bunch of grapes in his vineyard; he brought them to town and handed them to the authorities. They expected the pillory. This the Rath proposed, but the Rathsherr Christopf Rues, who belonged to the Silberrad party, insisted on a prosecution for witchcraft. It was undertaken, but the most that could be extracted from Eva under torture was that three years before she had surrendered herself to the demon Biberlein, who promised her ample money during life, but what he gave her turned to potsherds. Marie, on the other hand, under torture freely accused her mother and herself. Two years before, her marriage with the demon Kreutlin had been celebrated; there were present Else Gwinner (daughter of Laubbach), also the Frau Fritz and the wife of Kaspar Silberrad, who had boasted that she had been a witch for twenty-two years. Also the wife of the Stettmeister Sandhaflin and Wyss, the old female town secretary. She evidently recognized her case as hopeless and was resolved to avenge herself. She was especially hard on Else Gwinner, saying she had boasted practicing witchcraft for sixteen years. She

had emptied quantities of caterpillars and beetles in the town forests and had such hatred for the town that as long as she lived there would be no more acorns. The acorn crop in those days was a matter of supreme importance, and in Offenburg the town forest not only enabled the citizens to fatten their swine but in good years was a source of considerable revenue. Every year in September a commission was appointed to inspect the forests and report the prospect (p. 110). A year before she had married her daughter to the demon Hämerlin. Marie also gave details as to herself and as to the Sabbat. Both were tortured again, when Eva confessed and Marie added that the demon had visited her in prison, had knocked her head against the wall and sought to kill her. Mother and daughter were confronted and each stood to her confession.—Ib., pp. 39–45.

Eva was condemned to death by fire and Marie to beheading. As the latter heard her sentence she grew desperate and declared she would not die without Frau Silberrad and it was hard to silence her. On the way to execution, November 22, 1601, she passed the houses of Laubbach, Ruprecht Silberrad and Stehlin, and said that Laubbach had still two daughters who had done much injury to Silberrad and Stehlin, the latter of whom used this as evidence against Laubbach's Helene.—Ib., p. 48.

On the strength of the evidence against Else Gwinner, the Rath on October 31 ordered her arrest. At her first audience she denied. Confronted with Marie Vetter she persisted, when Marie exclaimed, "Shed tears—you can no more do it than I," and when questioned as to her tearlessness she said the evil demon took away the water from the eyes; when a witch wept it was because the demon spirted water into them. Eva Vetter also ratified her evidence against her. The judges urged her to spare herself suffering, but she was firm. When hoisted she screamed fearfully and begged to be let down, as she would confess, but immediately afterwards she prayed, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do," and after this, in spite of all the efforts of the executioner, she seemed to feel nothing. This led the Rath to change her prison to where she could be becomingly examined. It also sought counsel of the Kirchherr.—Ib., p. 46.

These proceedings excited animadversion, but the Rath, on the strength of the evidence of the Vetters and of an inquisition made by the Kirchherr in 1598 and of a communication

obtained from him, resolved to arrest Agathe the young daughter of Else Gwinner. The Kirchherr promised his service in reasoning with and warning her, and the help of the Church. At her examination she repelled the accusation with an audacity surprising in so young a girl. Her mother was tortured again on November 7, when, on the third hoist, she shrieked that she could not endure it and confessed that she had enjoyed the love of the demon. This was insufficient and the torture was increased till the heaviest weights were used, but she declared that her confessions were lies to escape the suffering—they were exhorting her to tell the truth, and the truth was that she was innocent. Finally the torture was discontinued.—Ib., pp. 46–7.

Eva Vetter's statements concerning Else and Agathe became vacillating, but she then strengthened them, and with her daughter Marie confirmed them under oath. But on November 14 Agathe denied them so thoughtlessly and gave her accusers the lie so impudently that the Rath was astonished. She was then confronted with Marie, who asked her if she did not remember how they two attempted to raise a storm which should destroy the harvests and raise the price of a loaf to a shilling so that her mother could provide for her children, and she described all details. Agathe denied it all, was taken back to her cell and beaten with rods till she confessed.—Ib., p. 47.

On the day when the Vetters were executed (November 22), Agathe's accusations against her mother were told to her. Else could not believe it, and they were confronted. Agathe could not speak, "her heart was too full." When her mother reproached her for the false accusations, she said it was through fear of the rods—but she admitted that she had met the two Fischers, who had testified against her, before the gates at early morning without being able to answer the question whence she came. The mother in anguish exclaimed, "Why did I not drown this unfortunate child in her first bath?" "Oh had you only done so," replied the child mournfully. She was led away, her mother calling after her, "Do not let the torture trouble you," but when returned to her cell she confirmed her confession, begging that she should not again be made to face her mother.—Ib., p. 48.

Else, however, was unshaken. To overcome the devil's help, she was taken to another prison and her clothes were changed, but in spite of this she still maintained her innocence.

The thumbscrews were applied severely; she only called on God to help her; the torture was redoubled and she begged for its cessation, but when this was granted she repeated her assertions of innocence. Finally, however, seeing that there was no escape and that worse was threatened, she commenced to confess the ordinary story as to the demon. But "on account of the intense cold" no more could be extracted from her and the continuance of the torture was postponed until December 11. Then she denied all guilt and when the executioner was called she begged with weeping to see her daughter and the Kirchherr. This was refused and she was tortured, but in spite of it for awhile she seemed to sleep; cold water was dashed in her face, when she screamed and begged release, but as soon as the torture was intermitted she revoked her confession. The examiners were tired and increased the torture till she could endure it no longer, when she confessed her connection with her incubus and two flights to the Sabbat; when asked about accomplices she named Frau Spiess and the Altrathschreiberin Wyss. Promised to remember more.—Ib., p. 49.

December 13 she revoked her confession and begged to see her daughter. The priest Lazarus was sent to her, but in spite of his exhortations she admitted no guilt. On the 15th the judges represented to her the obstinacy with which she withheld her guilt from the preacher, who knew from her daughter all her misdoings and was seeking to save her soul. They told her of the decision of the Rath to continue the torture without mercy or compassion until she should tell the truth. She became faint, but asserted her innocence. When bound, she implored to be spared fresh torture; she would rather confess and then die. Then she repeated her former confession, but withdrew the accusation against Frau Spiess and Frau Wyss. She was convinced she was mistaken —at the Sabbat there was such crowd and confusion that identification was difficult, especially as all present covered their faces as much as possible; besides the devil could take any shape he chose. She was required to swear to this, but refused, and when the oath was insisted on she cried bitterly.

This brave and high-minded woman was sentenced on December 19 and burnt on the 21st.—Ib., p. 50.

Her daughter Agathe, meanwhile, at the request of the Kirchherr, was confined in a small cell in chains. It was expected that, when in fourteen days the efforts of the Church

had reconciled her, the kindred would exert themselves for her release; but compassion had been forfeited by her childish weakness under the rods, and on December 31 the family formally abandoned her to the Rath, which involved the authorities in perplexity. Parental love conquered, however, and on January 9, 1602, Martin Gwinner petitioned the Rath to spare her life in consideration for her youth. She was pardoned under the condition of taking the *Urphede* and of her father removing her to some Catholic place and giving security against her return. This mercy was very displeasing to the witch-baiters. She was sent to Weissenburg, where her excellent conduct obtained her a husband in 1605 and in that year she was allowed to visit her father on condition of keeping herself housed.—Ib., pp. 51–2.

As to Helene and Adelheid Laubbach, their fate is uncertain, as the protocols of 1603 and 1604, in which their cases might fall, have been lost. Helene, however, escaped death, for in 1605 there was a suit between the Rath and the prelate of Altdorf, where she was residing, about the vindication of the prisoner Helene Laubbach—a suit which was dropped at the suggestion of the prelate.—Ib., p. 52.

November 25, 1601, Kaspar Silberrad and, on December 5, Hans Ruprecht, asked the Rath for the arrest of Hans König's wife. In time they must have been successful, for in 1607 we find König appealing for a reduction of the expenses of her execution, which must have occurred in 1603 or 1604, of which the protocols have disappeared. From another source we learn that on June 20, 1603 or 1604, two women were burnt in Offenburg—the wife of Hans Bluethard and Barbara Hirn, widow of Michael Rodalph.—Ib., pp. 52–3.

In 1605 and 1606 there were no executions, although there were inquisitions.

Persecution broke out again in 1608. On June 16, Wolf Fehr applied for permission to send his wife Maria to their son-in-law in Strassburg. (Apparently no one could leave the town without permission.—H. C. L.) The Rath hesitated and asked the opinions of jurists, as the woman was suspect of witchcraft. Graf v. Sulz, President of the Kammergericht of Speyer, said that, although she was not accused of doing harm and was of upright life, she could be prosecuted with the advice of jurists, for even the devil could assume the appearance of a just man. This pleased the Rath, which had feared disturbance in case of allowing her departure; the

repeated applications of Fehr were postponed and early in July she was arrested. Fehr's demand for copy of accusation was evaded and he appealed to the Kaiserliche Kammergericht at Speyer. (As this was the imperial court, it was the place to which to appeal from the local court of a Reichstadt—H. C. L.) for her release under bail, but by this time she had made confession and had accused Anna, wife of Michel Gütle, who was arrested July 10 and in turn accused Anna Keller, who again accused Christina Eckhard. So efficacious were the means employed to obtain confession that on August 8 the three latter were condemned to the stake, though in consideration of their age and infirmities they were first mercifully beheaded. Maria Fehr was executed October 6—see below.—Ib., pp. 53–4.

August 18, Maria Betzler was arrested. She accused her son and Sabina, daughter of Christina Eckhard, who were arrested August 25, and on September 12 the Betzlers were executed, the mother by fire and the son with preliminary beheading.—Ib., p. 54.

October 6, Frau Fehr, together with the widow Fiedler (arrested August 29) and Ottilia, wife of Wilhelm Ott (arrested September 6), was executed—all beheaded and burnt.

The widow Fiedler had accused the widow of Hans Roch, Anna wife of Adam Götzen, Ursula wife of Claus Braun and Apollonia wife of the baker Haug. All were beheaded and burnt, the former October 10 and the three latter October 20.

Frau Reichlin bought some marmalade in the market from Frau Dietrich; then she, her husband and son fell sick, whereupon she accused the Dietrich, who was already suspect of witchcraft. The latter was arrested October 8; there was no evidence and the trial lingered. On January 17, 1609, her husband and son-in-law complained of the delay and of the costs piling up on them (apparently the accused was liable for expenses—H. C. L.) and demanded that judgment be pronounced, either of death or discharge. She was thereupon smartly tortured (on what grounds?—H. C. L.) but without success, and was discharged on bail given by the two men that she would not leave the jurisdiction.—Ib., pp. 54–5.

The following case illustrates the spirit of persecution, some details of prison discipline and also jurisdiction.

Maria Anna Hoffmann, wife of Eberhard Pabst, was of unblemished life, and her position is shown in that when she was

to be arrested, October 15, 1608, to avoid making a sensation her husband was ordered to find some pretext for bringing her before the court. What evidence, if any, there was against her seems not to be recorded. On January 23, 1609, her husband asked that she should have a measure of wine between meals, as the measure and a half daily allowed was insufficient. As this was at his cost, it was allowed. Then, as he believed her to be pregnant, he asked that she be examined by a midwife and be allowed to come home, or that he be permitted to visit her in prison, which was refused, when he applied to the Kaiserliche Kammergericht without success. The Rath, however, became anxious and, in September, 1609, applied for advice to jurists in Freiburg, whose opinion was that, if the prisoner had done no wrong, even if there was some evidence against her, she should be discharged after taking the *Urphede* and giving security for the costs, then amounting to 330 florins. This the Rath refused to do, as the matter was hanging in Speyer and the costs were large. The Procurator Seyblin in Speyer was vainly pressing them for a decision, which they postponed by withholding their statements under pretext of the death of their scrivener, Berschi. Finally, on January 13, 1610, came a decision of the Kammergericht that they should send the evidence, allow her legal defence, freedom of movement and access to her (*Ab- und Zugang*) and strictly observe lawful procedure. Dr. Rosa, the counsel empowered under this, was accompanied, on seeing her, by the Schultheiss and four Stettmeister, but the husband was rudely refused access. In March, 1610, he begged that she be allowed to come home, as she was very sick. The Rath sent her urine to Dr. Heidenreich in Strassburg, who found it alarming, but could not come on account of sickness. August 3, Pabst was allowed to see her, for in her sickness she refused all help that he had not approved in advance. August 9, in the witch-court they consulted as to finding something about (against?) her. Information was put together, and on August 29 the accusation was framed, and Pabst was imprisoned for bitter speaking, but was released September 11, and he was permitted, under orders of a physician, to give her better food and wine. On February 23, 1611, the Schultheiss reported to the Rath that she would have to be transferred to the insane hospital, and in April she died. The last act of the miserable tragedy was the selling at auction, in February, 1612, the property of the

Pabst family in order to defray the accumulated costs.—Ib., pp. 55–7.

Then for a considerable time the witch persecution ceased. We have seen how it recommenced in the Landvogtei Ortenau in 1627 and it soon involved Offenburg. On November 7, 1627, the Ortenau authorities communicated evidence given by their prisoners, and at once by order of the Schultheiss and four Stettmeister (apparently they had power to arrest—H. C. L.) Katherine Brem, wife of David Holdermann, was arrested. Her denial led the Rath on November 8 to order the sharpest torture (apparently this depended on the Rath—H. C. L.), which proved resultless; the executioner Mathis asked for heavier weights and other implements, which the Rath granted, and ordered a witch-chair to be made, and at the same time desired the Kirchherr to use spiritual means with the stubborn woman. He was unsuccessful, but the executioner from Windschläg was called in and without the chair a torture of eleven to twelve hours brought a confession. She inculpated two other women (who had already in 1622 been tried and tortured for witchcraft, but had been discharged). They were arrested and torture extracted confession. Proceedings were speedy: on November 27 the Rath ordered wood to be brought for the burning, though the confessions were not ratified until the 29th nor the judgment pronounced till December 1. On December 3 all three were burnt. As one of them, Frau Holdermann, made testamentary provisions on November 29, and after hearing the sentence provided other legacies, there cannot at this time have been confiscation.—Ib., pp. 58–61.

On charges from the Ortenau, Simon Haller was tortured, November 12 and again November 13, without confession. The Rath was thinking of discharging him when fresh evidence came from there and he was tortured again unsuccessfully, December 4. Then a confrontation was arranged with one of his accusers, resulting in another torture of the severest kind, December 10, without confession. December 16 there came further evidence; by this time the witch-chair had been provided and he was placed in it and kept until 7 P.M., when he offered to confess; the Stettmeister came between 8 and 9 and took his confession. The next day, the 17th, he confirmed his confession under threat of being placed in the chair again if he revoked it. On December 20 he petitioned the Rath to let him lie over Christmas, but it resolved on executing

him with three other witches to be burnt, and he was warned that any revocation would put him back in the chair. The three others were Lucia Linder, Christine, wife of the cooper Häusler, and Maria, wife of Caspar Geringer. They had been accused from the Ortenau and had confessed speedily under torture. All four were beheaded and burnt December 24. The Stettmeister Philipp Beck offered to furnish the wood. (His own wife was burnt on August 29, 1629.)—Ib., pp. 61–4.

November 9, 1627, Ursula, wife of Hans Schlininger, was arrested on evidence from the Ortenau, one woman there having seen her a hundred times at the Sabbat and another implicating also her daughters. She was the daughter of Ottilia Ott, burned October 6, 1608, and was of evil repute, though her first husband, Kilian Widerstetter, had been Schultheiss in 1615. The Rath ordered her subjected to sharp torture the next day, but the thumbscrew elicited nothing. There was talk of her being pregnant, and further torture was postponed till December 30, when she overcame it again. Then she made a confession and was tortured January 3, 1628, when she revoked it. Then she was placed in the witch-chair, which in half a quarter of an hour brought confession. It was incomplete, however, and on January 5 she was placed again in the chair, which brought full confession, and when on January 11 she was made to confirm it, it was in sight of the chair, to be used in case of retraction. She was beheaded and burnt January 14, with four others.—Ib., pp. 64–6.

This speaks volumes for the superiority of the witch-chair. Persecution evidently was now in full blast.

One of these others was the wife of the Stettmeister Megerer, one of the most active and public-spirited citizens. Megerer had filled many offices and made many enemies who thus sought revenge. His wife was arrested January 4, 1628, tortured the same day without success, tortured again next morning, when she confessed, confirmed it at once under torture, sentenced January 12, and beheaded and burnt on the 14th. Her husband resigned his various offices and desired to leave Offenburg, but was refused permission and heavily fined for his free speech. He died February 18, 1630, luckily for him, for he was already accused by the witches of the Ortenau.—Ib., pp. 66–71.

Another of the five burnt on January 14, 1628, was Maria, daughter of Hans Scheutlin—her mother Barbara was arrested

December 8 (see below). All five women had been tortured and confessed. On January 11 their confessions were read to them and they were told that, if they revoked, they would be tortured anew; all ratified; they were sentenced January 12 and beheaded and burnt on the 14th.—Ib., pp. 71–2.

The above-named Ursula Schlininger had four children by her first husband, Widerstetter. Two of them, young girls, Barbara and Anna Maria, were accused from the Ortenau, together with Ursula Weid, and all three were arrested. The stepfather, Schlininger, then refused longer to support the two youngest and claimed that the authorities must do so (illustrating the hardships cast on the innocent and unprotected—H. C. L.). The three girls readily confessed under torture, confirmed their confessions and were condemned to beheading and burning on June 16. On that day, however, when the Rath assembled it was informed that Ursula Weid had revoked and her execution was postponed; then the two Widerstetter girls begged to have theirs delayed; they would willingly die with her, but not without her. Ursula had another hearing, when she confirmed again her confession "to escape the hellish pain," and all three were executed June 19, 1628.—Ib., pp. 72–3.

Already, on June 16, Frau Drittenbach had been arrested and on June 23 there followed the widow of Kaspar Weid, mother of the burnt Ursula, and also the widow of Jakob Kayser. On June 27 the wife of the Stettmeister Philipp Baur and Magdalena, wife of the Italian Franz, were arrested. All these confessed speedily under torture except Magdalena, who withstood repeated torture until, June 30 at 11 A.M., she was placed in the witch-chair, in which, at 11 P.M., she suddenly died. She was ordered to be buried under the gallows; the other four were sentenced July 5 and beheaded and burnt July 7.—Ib., pp. 73–4.

In the sitting of July 10 the Rath resolved to restrain the arrests of women.—Ib., p. 74.

The Stettmeister, Philipp Baur, whose wife had been executed, accused painter Schwartz on October 16 of maligning his daughter by expressing wonder that Franz Bohrer would marry her, seeing that she was a witch. Then, November 10, he applied to the Rath for the customary present of silverware at the wedding. The Rath granted it at his peril—that on November 17 he should cause his daughter to be arrested and examine her under torture, to be repeated on the 18th.

She confessed to renouncing God and the saints; but, becoming sick, the torture was postponed till November 24, when she confessed and confirmed her confession.—Ib., pp. 74–5.

November 18, Gertrude, wife of Stettmeister Weselin, was arrested and examined under torture; it had been his turn to do this, but he was replaced by Stettmeister Dädinger. She confessed willingly and confirmed it under torture.—Ib., p. 75.

November 20, Anna, wife of Michel Meyer, was arrested. At first she confessed nothing, but under torture confessed freely (p. 75).

November 25, 1628, old Anna, widow of Hans Hauff, was arrested. In 1616 she had complained to the Rath that the wife of Philipp Benedikt had called her a witch. The Rath [at that time] imprisoned both women; the Benedikt woman had much to tell of the other's witchcraft, but the Rath concluded it was all idle tattle, and discharged both. But those days were now over; the old woman overcame the first torture, but succumbed to two days' repetition and confessed.—Ib., pp. 75–6.

All these four women were condemned on November 29 and beheaded and burnt on December 1. (Quick work.—H. C. L.)—Ib., p. 76.

Baur felt keenly the deaths of his wife and daughter—the latter on the eve of her wedding. He had been a member of the Rath since 1617 (apparently the Stettmeister were four of the members having certain duties—H. C. L.) and had discharged many important duties. December 11 he sent in his resignation with the remark that his daughter's arrest and execution had been only to disgrace him. The Rath took no action and sent him word not to take matters so hardly. In January, 1629, he repeated his application for release, saying that it was not out of spite, but because of his trouble and grief. At the same time he was outspoken in his talk and complained of the excessive costs levied on him. He was summoned before the Rath to answer, which he did January 22, repeating that it was only through his grief and he begged for pardon. But he remained, and on November 22 he presided as a councillor at the festivities of his son's wedding.—Ib., pp. 76–7.

December 4 was arrested Barbara, wife of Hans Scheutlin and mother of the Maria executed January 14; also the widow of Georg Fink. Then on December 8 Barbara, wife of Andreas Gerhard, and Maria, daughter of Hans Beverlin.

All four confessed readily; they were condemned December 13 and executed on the 15th (Quick work!—H. C. L.).—Ib., p. 78.

Observe that thus far all are women. At last there is a man, Jakob Linder, son of the burnt Lucia Sator and son-in-law of the Stettmeister Kaspar Hag. He was strongly suspected and also thought to meditate flight; so, though there was no evidence against him, he was arrested December 18. Repeated torture brought no confession, so the Ortenau authorities were applied to for evidence, but they had none, though some executed women had said they had seen with the devil a man named Jakob with a black beard and his head covered with a black cloth. Then on December 23 Hag represented in the name of his daughter the heavy expenses incurred which impoverished her and she begged for consideration on account of her children. The Rath out of kindness lent her, on good security, some money out of the hospital funds. When Linder heard that his wife had had a mass sung for him he burst into tears and loud lamentations. The torture was suspended, but he was kept in prison. Then some women were arrested, among whom Frau Beverlin said she had seen him twice in the Sabbat; they were confronted January 21, 1629, when she betrayed the utmost mendacity. On the 25th he was tortured without result. Then the witch-chair was brought into play and "good care was taken of the fire and cords" and the torture was unmasked. On the 27th and 29th he was tortured again, but without confession. Meanwhile the arrested women were executed, but he was left until a "Todeskamerad" could be found. (Apparently condemnation did not require confession—what, then, was the use of torture?—H. C. L.)—Ib., pp. 78–9.

Burnt February 16—see below.

On January 3 Eva, daughter of Mäder, was arrested, but she endured torture without confession, and on February 16 she was restored to her father. On the other hand, Anna, widow of Jakob Schew, the wife of Hans Waltenburg and the wife of Hans Beverlin were executed January 24 after brief imprisonment (p. 79).

January 29 Hans, son of Michel Ros, was arrested and speedily confessed, so that on February 16 he accompanied Jakob Linder to execution. Only the Schultheiss was present. When we are told that the *Pfalzmehl* was omitted, it would appear that the officials indulged in a repast after an execu-

tion, as was customary in the Netherlands a century earlier (p. 79).

Anna Fritsch, wife of Mühlhaus, was to be arrested January 12, but on account of severe illness it was postponed till April 20, when she speedily confessed. On May 4 she was executed, together with Anna, daughter of Georg Fink (her widowed mother was executed December 15), and the midwife, wife of Michel Ros (and mother of Hans Ros, burnt February 16). She was further sentenced to be torn twice with red-hot pincers on the way to execution.—Ib., pp. 79–80.

April 20, Thomas Wittich sued Ruprecht Silberrad before the Rath for saying that he was strongly suspect of witchcraft, and he also complained of the Secretary of the Ortenau for insulting him and saying that he had repeatedly been accused by the burnt women. The case against Silberrad was postponed and the Rath sent at once to Ortenberg for the evidence, which came next day and showed that he had been thrice positively accused and twice presumptively, so that he was at once arrested. He was a man of evil reputation for quarrelsomeness. He endured unflinchingly daily torture and on April 26 it was suspended, awaiting the return of the scrivener. In the middle of May he was freshly accused by witches and on this he was severely tortured without success. Then the unfailing witch-chair was brought into play and on May 21 he confessed. He was told that next Friday (25th) would be judgment day for others and, if he could be ready, he would be included; if not, he would suffer the chair again. He was ready.—Ib., pp. 80–1.

His comrades were four women—the wife of Konrad Vollmer, Agnes, wife of Wolf Jung, Margarethe Schöpflin, wife of Thomas Wachtel, and the widow of Simon Nonnemann. All five were sentenced on May 25 and beheaded and burnt May 28.—Ib., pp. 81–2.

It is noteworthy how constantly in these cases the weddings with demons are referred to. It has become an indispensable part of the myth.

On the day of execution, May 28, the vacated cells were filled with four more arrests. Margarethe Schöpflin had accused her two daughters, Magdalene and Katherine. The others were the baker Jakob Roser, who had often been punished for light-weight loaves (it required the chair to extort his confession), and Jeremias Huck. All four were beheaded and burnt June 11.—Ib., pp. 82–3.

On June 22 and 25 there were six arrests: Hans Bluom,

whose confession required the witch-chair; Ursula, daughter of Hans Veltlin Oswald; the widow of baker Hans Hassens; Magdalene, widow of Philipp Ritter; the wife of Hans Dunner, who confessed in the witch-chair, then said it was on account of the insufferable pain, but, on being replaced in it, confirmed her confession; Lupfen Berbel.

All six were sentenced July 4 and executed July 6.—Ib., pp. 83–4.

The priests asked for pay in view of the labor with these many executions, but the request was rejected.—Ib., p. 84.

August 8, the Rath resolved on the return of the Stadtschreiber, Marcellus Ruoff, to resume the persecution.

August 13, arrest of Mader's son, of Ottilie, wife of Hans Lang, Jr., and of Martin Betz. All confessed with the first torture.

August 17, the wife of Johann Nagel.

August 20, the wife of Stettmeister Philipp Beck—the one who had offered the wood for the burning of Simon Haller. She was a young, beautiful and attractive woman. Beck asked the Rath to permit him to write to his wife (apparently all communication with prisoners was forbidden and we nowhere hear of any defence allowed—H. C. L.), saying she might confess to unfaithfulness and she should be tortured about young Hauser.

August 29, all five were executed and Frau Nagel was torn with red-hot pincers in the right breast.

When, on October 5, the collection of the costs of these trials was ordered, Beck vigorously disputed those of his wife: it was an attack on his property and people must take him for a fool—for which speech he was fined.—Ib., pp. 84–5.

After these trials there was a pause until October 8, when the Rath resolved "mit dem Hexenbrennen soll man wieder fortfahren." No time was lost and that same day were arrested Marie, daughter of Hans Götzen, Michel Wittich (father of the executed Thomas), Katherina, wife of Jakob Hänlin, who all three were executed on October 19.—Ib., p. 85.

Three weeks later the Rath ordered the arrest of Pulver-Margarethe, Franz Göppert and the Rathsherr Hans Georg Bauer, who was also Master of the Artillery, wine-valuer and cabinet-maker. All three soon confessed under torture, were sentenced November 21 and executed November 23.—Ib., pp. 85–6.

August 17, Magdalena, wife of Hans Georg Holdermann,

was arrested. He represented that she expected to be confined after Michaelmas and to save expense asked that she be allowed to remain at home, which was granted under his pledge of body and goods to present her after the child's baptism. In September he asked that she be allowed to go to church, which was refused, but in spite of this she went and he was warned not to forget his engagement. On January 2, 1630, he represented that she would no longer keep to the house, whereupon she was imprisoned and tortured. Repeated tortures brought no confession until the witch-chair was used, and on January 14 it was resolved to keep her in prison until she should ratify her various confessions. (For the rest of her trial, see below.)—Ib., p. 86.

November 12, 1629, Gotter Ness (a woman) was imprisoned and denied emphatically under two tortures. Then the chair was employed. Only in the fiercest torture of this did she commence to confess and this she immediately retracted. (Volk says no man had as yet overcome the chair—but see above Jakob Linder, Volk, p. 79.—H. C. L.) On receiving this report, November 19, the Rath ordered the torture repeated, leaving its degree to the Stettmeister, so that she could be sentenced on the 21st with Bauer, Göppert and Pulver-Margarethe. The Stettmeister again used the chair, but Gotter Ness confessed nothing. On the 23d the barber-surgeon was sent to her, for her legs had been badly injured by the "Beinschraube" and, on December 3, it was reported that she was very sick and weak and was expected to die. Still the chair was again used; but she asserted her innocence. Then it was resolved that she be sent to her house, the Kirchherr be sent to her and further proceedings be postponed till after Christmas. What was the final result seems not to be recorded.—Ib., p. 87.

January 2, 1630, Frau Holdermann (see above) and Maria, daughter of Gotter Ness, were arrested, and on January 12 Ursula, daughter of Jakob Burg. On the 23d they were condemned on the strength of their confessions, but the next day they unanimously retracted and asserted innocence. The Stettmeister in function was sent to them with the Stadtschreiber and the Kirchherr, and next day the Schultheiss saw them. They all declared their innocence. Now, under the universal practice, they should have been relegated to the witch-chair, but there seems to have been a sudden reversal of public opinion and this was not resorted to. The

officials joyfully accepted the proposition of the priest that he would pray God, in the holy office of the Mass, to assist justice. This afforded an excuse for postponement and the prisoners were remanded to prison until further decision. As on February 4 they persisted in asserting innocence, they were released, but confined to their houses, and on the 19th they were amerced in the costs.—Ib., pp. 87–8.

In this dramatic fashion the witch-craze in Offenburg came virtually to an end. There were still, however, some traces. On May 9 a small pot was found on the Klosterplatz, containing some leaves and papers, which was at once attributed to sorcery, but there was no tenable ground for action. Then on January 31, 1631, a weak-minded youth named Moritz Mendlin was sent to Offenburg on suspicion of sorcery by the Fathers at Molsheim. Under torture he confessed something and was beheaded February 12.—Ib., p. 88.

The officials of the Landvogtei were still at work and sent word that many Offenburg women were accused. The Stadtschreiber was sent there and found many whose names occurred four or five or more times in the protocols, but the Rath was too much engaged with meeting the necessities of the war to undertake a new prosecution. Then, on September 11, 1632, the Swedes occupied the town, when steel and fire drove away the epidemic. The witch-craze may be reckoned as ending with 1630. The subsequent traces may be disregarded. In February, 1639, the young Hans Linder was arrested for suspicion of witchcraft, but was discharged. —Ib., p. 89.

The Landvogtei of Ortenau seems to have been an imperial fief. We are told that Graf Wilhelm von Fürstenberg, who died in 1548, was "kaiserlicher Landvogt." He was a zealous Lutheran and sought to put a Protestant pastor in the Marienkirche, but he was driven out with insults and beating. —Ib., p. 102.

Volk says there is no evidence that in Offenburg the priestly element did anything to stimulate persecution. There is not much allusion to their intervention, but when it occurs it is generally in favor of the accused.—Ib., p. 103.

At the same time the author is severe on the Church at large, to which he attributes the development and extension of the witch-craze.—Ib., pp. 101–2, 104.

We have seen above that there was no confiscation in Offenburg, but it seems to have been otherwise in the Land-

vogtei, whose officials undertook to seize the property there of those executed in Offenburg—Haller, Marie Linder, Geringer—and on October 31, 1629, summoned the heirs to appear. The Rath at once appealed to the Kaiserliches Kammergericht at Speyer, entered a notarial protest and forbade the kindred under a fine to obey the "Austrian" summons. It also fined Hans Schwab when he made a compromise with the Ortenauers to escape greater loss. The imperial court must have decided in favor of the heirs, as Ferdinand II (1619–36) had already forbidden such confiscation.—Ib., p. 105.

Volk points out how, as in the case of Maria Vetter, rage at the injustice would prompt the prisoner under torture to bring as many unfortunates as possible into the same straits. In many cases also there was a strange comfort felt in having companions at the stake. There was also the desire to lead the persecution into absurdity, as in the case of Frau Mengis and the daughter of Hans Schertlin, at Appenweier, who denounced innumerable accomplices. There were not many like Else Gwinner, who withstood the sharpest torture without denouncing more than one and then retracted that one. —Ib., pp. 109–11.

There was also the fact that by early and free denunciation the torture was lightened.

There were two watchers stationed in the cell with the prisoner, and, as they were mostly rude and uncultivated, it can be imagined how the sufferings of the prisoners were increased, especially when they were women. A quarrel between two of these fellows and their mutual accusations show to what lengths they might go, especially when drunk.—Ib., pp. 112–13.

From a complaint of an Ortenberg official it would appear that at the execution the confessions of the condemned were read publicly.—Ib., p. 113.

This was an education in witchcraft and largely accounts for the uniformity of the confessions, on which so much stress was laid by demonologists.

At the beginning and during the process women and girls were subjected to an indecent examination by the executioner (p. 113).

After an exhibition of the instruments of torture and instruc-

tion as to their effectiveness the *gütliche Verhör* was discontinued (p. 113).

The witch-chair was reckoned as the most effective implement. It was an iron chair studded with blunted points, of which the seat was heated from below. When necessary this was prolonged for days, until exhaustion, as in the case of Haller, or death, as in that of "welsch Magdalen." It required heroic fortitude for a woman like Gotter Ness to endure repeated applications and still maintain her innocence.—Ib., p. 114.

The ordinary form of execution was to carry the condemned in a wagon to the Rathaus, where the Stettmeister publicly read the confessions (or sentences?). Thence they were taken through the Neuthor to the Galgenfeld, accompanied by a mocking and abusive crowd with yells of hatred and derision. There was with these poor witches an earnest desire to have companions and not to be exposed singly to this. It was an especial favor, occasionally granted, to take the condemned direct from the prison, accompanied by the Schultheiss, to the place of execution and to forbid the citizens from passing beyond the gates. Towards the end, beheading preceded burning.—Ib., p. 116.

The costs were a heavy burden on the family. The two watchers received each a weekly wage of 10 batzen (1 florin) and 7 measures or Masse (a Mass = one half-gallon) of wine. The executioner, for bringing a prisoner from one prison to another, had 10 batzen, and his assistants each 2 batzen. After every audience, the judges had a banquet in the Pfalz, reckoned at 4 batzen per head and 2 batzen for the messengers. The executioner claimed the prisoner's bed with its feathers, but this was forbidden December 1, 1627. The watchers carried off the good clothes of the prisoners to the disgust of Meister Mathis, the executioner, who forestalled them in the case of Jakob Linder by taking them before he was sentenced. In the case of Frau Fehr the city spent in investigations, from July, 1608, to September, 1609, the sum of 330 gulden. (Ought not this to be Frau Pabst—see above under 1609.—H. C. L.)—Ib., pp. 117–19.

Costs were piled up unconscionably, until they amounted virtually to confiscation. In an account for three women burnt alive at Appenweier, June 22, 1595, there appear such items as these, incurred in the three days between their sentence and execution:

	Florins.	*Batzen.*	*Pfennige.*
For the executioner . .	14	7	10
For the entertainment and banquet of the judges, priests and advocate .	32	6	3
For maintenance of the convicts and watchers . .	33	6	6

(The batzen is 1/10 florin, the pfennig 1/12 batzen.—H. C. L.)—Ib., p. 118.

The rigid orthodoxy of Offenburg is displayed in a decree of the Rath, April 19, 1591, that in future no one but a Catholic should be admitted as a burgher, no matter what his noble or civic position might be.—Ib., p. 128.

So zealous were they that after Easter the Kirchherr would send to the Rath all the certificates of confession; these were distributed among the various guilds with instructions to report their members who had not confessed. These were then summoned before the Rath and, if they could not show valid reasons, were imprisoned for three days, with warning that it would be prolonged if within fourteen days they could not display a certificate.—Ib., p. 129.

The schools were wholly in the hands of the clergy, who prescribed the books, which were procured from the Jesuits.—Ib., p. 130.

The government was in the hands of the Rath, or Council. Of this, one-half consisted of representatives of the ten guilds, each of which proposed three candidates, out of whom the Rath selected one. The other half was nominated by the Rath itself (I suppose by coöptation—H. C. L.). At its head was the Schultheiss, or mayor, assisted by the Syndikus and Stadtschreiber. The Schultheiss and four Stettmeister formed the executive, and these conducted all criminal prosecutions, but the judgment was pronounced by the assembled Rath. The two priests of the town were, as rectors of the schools, ex-officio members of the Rath (p. 130).

It is somewhat remarkable that nowhere in his abstracts of trials and cases does the author even once allude to what elsewhere bore so large a part in the investigations—the witch-mark, tears and taciturnity—though possibly the former may have been included in the preliminary indecent examination of which he speaks on p. 113. Yet he could scarce have avoided mentioning, at least in a few cases, that a mark had been found, or that in the confession the accused had stated how it was conferred. The indecent examination was probably to discover charms concealed.

LEMPENS, CARL.—*Geschichte der Hexen und Hexenprozesse.* St. Gallen, 1880.

There is a collection of terrible statistics as to Germany in this pamphlet, pp. 61–7. The author is so sensational that one hesitates to give full credence to his statements, but some of the items may be of service to fill out the details in Soldan-Heppe and Diefenbach.

He says that Tanner's influence with the Elector of Bavaria put an end, during his life, to the witch-burnings, but after his death they were resumed.—Lempens, p. 69.

I suppose we may trust the following, which he says is drawn from the Rathsbücher of Offenburg, a little town of 2000 or 3000 inhabitants, now in Baden.

In 1627 there were executions for witchcraft in the neighboring town of Artenberg, and during the trials under torture the accused named some women of Offenburg as being seen on the Blocksberg. This was reported to Offenburg and the town-council proceeded forthwith to purify the community. By December 1, three women were burnt and five more on December 20. Of course accusations multiplied. On January 12, 1628, five victims were burnt and in six weeks thereafter thirteen more. There was care in selecting women of property and the five burnt on January 12 yielded good confiscations. In January the town was occupied by foreign troops (Thirty Years' War) and prosecutions ceased until their withdrawal early in June. They were promptly recommenced, and on the 14th there were three sentenced. One revoked her confession at the stake. She was taken back to the torture chamber and so effectually handled that she renewed her confession and was burnt on the 16th. Besides these, a young girl kept on the Hexenstuhl from noonday died about midnight; the Rath pronounced that Satan had twisted her neck and she was buried under the gallows. On June 27 a reward was offered of 2 shillings for the apprehension of witches. It stimulated persecution and, on July 7, four rich women were burnt. Then there came an impediment; Austria had extensive possessions in the district and claimed the confiscations of those inhabiting them. Prosecutions ceased until the question was decided in favor of the town, October 1, when they were recommenced. November 29 four wealthy women were burnt and four more on December 13. January 22, 1629, there were burnt three men of respectable condition. Then the citizens began to complain and representations were made to the Rath, January 28, that

undue force was used to compel the accused to denounce those whose names were suggested to them. The result was that on February 14 two of the popular leaders were burnt. On May 4 three women were burnt, and on May 25 four women and a man; on June 8 two women and two men, and on July 4 five women and one man. On August 29 five persons. Then came a serious impediment. The clergy complained that they were not sufficiently paid for their labors and demanded a larger share of the confiscations. A bitter controversy arose and prosecutions were suspended until an understanding was reached in October. Then on October 19 three women and a man were burnt, and on November 23 four persons. One of these latter, however, revoked her confession at the stake; she was tortured again and suffered January 7, 1630, together with one whose doom had been postponed on account of pregnancy. On January 14 the daughter of Jakob Bürken was arrested and tortured on the 16th (p. 75). (This shows how speedy was the process and that there was no reference to any higher authority; the local Rath with the Schultheiss seem to have had complete and independent control.[1]—H. C. L.) She nearly died under it and with two others was condemned on January 23, but the day before the execution all three revoked, apparently at the instigation of the clergy. The latter seem not to have been satisfied with the arrangement made as to their claims and protested against the repetition of the torture. The Schultheiss and Rath visited the women in prison and endeavored to make them renew their confessions, but in vain. The people joined in the protest, and on February 4 three were discharged as innocent, together with a number of others on trial. This put an end to the persecution for the time; the war again approached the town and put an end to it, but some years later it was renewed.—Ib., pp. 71–6.

The aggregate is 79 persons burnt in little over two years.

Haas, Carl.—*Die Hexenprozesse: ein cultur-historischer Versuch, nebst Dokumenten.* Tübingen, 1865.

He is evidently a Catholic.

Württemberg and Suabia had comparatively the fewest prosecutions for witchcraft and the period of the Thirty Years' War was that of the fiercest prosecution.—Haas, p. 14.

[1] But see note (p. 1148–9) on Volk's account of the prosecutions at Offenburg in 1608. The notes on Lempens were evidently culled by Mr. Lea before he had dealt with Volk's book.

Quotes from Leibnitz that Johann Philipp von Schönborn, when a canon of Würzburg, had a close friendship with Spee, who confided to him his authorship of the *Cautio Criminalis* and his conviction that none of the unfortunates whom he had accompanied to the stake were guilty. Schönborn became Bishop of Würzburg and then Archbishop of Mainz. Whenever one was accused of witchcraft he had her brought before him and was convinced of the truth of Spee's opinion, so that burnings ceased in his district.—Ib., pp. 15–16.

In 1783 a girl was executed for witchcraft in Protestant Glarus, and in 1793, 3 women in Posen.—Ib., p. 17.

In the little town of Waldsee (Württemberg) there are records showing the burning for witchcraft of 3 women in 1518, 1 in 1528, 1 in 1531, 11 in 1581, 7 in 1585, 16 in 1586, 2 in 1587, 3 in 1589, 2 in 1594.—Ib., pp. 84–7.

Observe, not a single man.

From a sentence it would seem that at the execution the people were assembled and there was read to them a full statement of the misdeeds confessed by the convicts (a liberal education in the superstition—H. C. L.).—Ib., p. 93.

In Augsburg, July 23, 1650, Barbara Fischerin is twice torn with red-hot pincers, then beheaded and burnt (p. 102). Also April 18, 1654, Anna Schäfflerin is executed in the same manner. Apparently this extra severity is because she twice trampled on the sacrament (p. 103). Barbara Fröhlin on the same day was simply beheaded before burning (p. 103). April 15, 1666, Anna Schwayhoferin, who had done the same, was sentenced to the same, but on account of her age and weakness the pincers were omitted.—Ib., pp. 102–4.

Apparently the pincers were an act of grace. In Augsburg, March 23, 1669, the sentence of Anna Eberlerin reads that for her misdeeds she should be burnt alive, but of grace she is only to be thrice torn with red-hot pincers, then beheaded, and her body burnt. (There is nothing about the sacrament. —H. C. L.) On the same day Regina Bartholomein is simply to be beheaded and burnt.—Ib., p. 105.

November 17, 1685, Maria Fleckin, Elissabetha Weberin and Anna Gschwenderin in a single sentence are to be beheaded and burnt—as an act of grace. March 16, 1686, Euphrosinae Endressin has the same sentence. She had killed children. (There seems to be a tendency to mercy.—H. C. L.) —Ib., p. 106.

May 25, 1686—the same for Apollonia Mayrin, *auss Gnaden.* May 2, 1690—the same for Anna Juditha Wagnerin, *auss Gnaden.*—Ib., p. 107.

July 27, 1694—the same for Ursula Gruenin. She had done much injury to men and cattle, but "da Sie sich bussfertig erzeigen, auss Gnaden" she is beheaded before burning.—Ib., p. 108.

A very significant illustration of Bavarian beliefs is found in the case of Anna Maria Schwägelin, in Kempten, in 1775. Kempten was a Fürstabtei. As a servant in a Protestant household at the age of from thirty to forty, the coachman promised her marriage if she would turn Protestant. She went to Memmingen, where she was formally converted, being obliged to renounce the Virgin and assert her reliance on God alone. The coachman deceived her and married another. Uneasy in conscience, she confessed to an Augustinian friar, who absolved her and told her this sufficed, if she repented and persisted in Catholicism. Soon afterwards the friar turned Protestant, which led her to doubt the sufficiency of his absolution, and she applied to a priest, who told her that she could only be absolved by the pope. This unsettled her conscience and mind, though she regularly confessed and communed. She became a wanderer, unable to keep any position, and finally, sick in body and mind, she drifted into the house of correction at Kempten. Here she was put under the charge of Anna Maria Kuhstaller, a woman of unsound mind who maltreated her and beat her. Once, in despair, she said to the nurse that she would rather live with the devil than where she was—and in prison she admitted that Kuhstaller with a threat of beating had forced her to confess that she had had intercourse with the devil. Kuhstaller thereupon denounced her for this and for having renounced God and the saints. Crippled in hand and feet, she was thrown into prison at Kempten, February 20, 1775. Proceedings were not commenced until March 6 and meanwhile the gaoler was ordered to watch her. Nothing was observed except a strange sound in the stove one night and a disturbance among the ducks in the yard—all of which was gravely adduced as evidence. Her trial was pushed with relentless zeal. Torture seems not to have been used, but a series of prolonged interrogatories confused her enfeebled brain until she was led to admit intercourse with the demon, which sometimes she said was once or twice in dreams and some-

times habitual in reality. There was no charge and no evidence of her having wrought evil to man or beast, but the judge, Treichlinger, "Hofrath und Landrichter," on March 30, drew up a sentence of beheading; it was agreed to by his colleagues, Feiger and Leiner, and confirmed by the Prince-Bishop. When it was announced to her on April 8 that she was to be executed on April 11, she said nothing, but wept bitterly, and the tragedy was duly completed.—Ib., pp. 108–19.

In Calw (Württemberg) about 1677 an old widow named Anna Haffnerin, suspected of witchcraft, and her step-grandson named Bartholomäus Gib, tried without conviction for poisoning a boy named Johann Crispin, were banished. After some years, however, they were permitted to return. She had two step-daughters. In 1683 a boy of eleven, of melancholic complexion, on being punished by his mother for some fault, told the serving-maid that he had done something much worse, which, if his mother knew, she would have punished him more severely. [He finally confessed that he and other children had been taken to witch-gatherings by Anna Haffnerin and Bartholomäus Gib. The two were accordingly condemned to death.]—Hauber, III, pp. 525–9.

Leitschuh, Friedrich.—*Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hexenwesens in Franken.* Bamberg, 1883.

(From the MS. trials at Bamberg, Leitschuh compiles an account of the witches' commencement and progress which differs in many respects from what I have elsewhere.—H. C. L.) The witches nearly all say that the devil first appears to them in the likeness of a lover, worthy of all confidence, but afterwards reveals himself. Sometimes it is misfortune which summons him, when he takes the shape of a rich merchant and promises help, if she will assign her soul to the devil. When he reveals himself, it is usually in the form of a he-goat, or a green devil, with owl's head, horned, black or fiery visage, goat's feet, long tail and hands with talons; later the demons show themselves as dragons. When the devil appears in all his majesty, he requires his victim to renounce God and give himself up to him, body and soul, threatening refusal with twisting his neck and carrying him to hell. In place of God, his heart must be given to the devil, who always requires adoration from his subjects. The witch must abjure the heavenly hosts and utter a formula which

is usually, "Here I stand on this dung and abjure our Lord Jesus Christ." One Bamberg witch said that her incubus gave her a twig as he claimed her forever, and scratched her finger and wrote her name with the blood.—Leitschuh, p. 26.

After the devil has thus acquired a subject, the new witch is to be baptized, mostly in a brook, at which wizards and witches are present. She is carried thither through the air for the first time. One of those present casts water over her, muttering unintelligible words. Another represents the godfather. She is baptized in the devil's name and receives a new satanic, blasphemous name. Her incubus, who has thus far concealed his true name, now discloses it, which is usually an odd one, *Schwarzlaster* (Blacksinner), *Mohr* (Moor), *Flederwisch* (Goose-wing), etc. She is then wished good luck in the devil's name. The money given by the godfather or godmother is a ducat, a gulden or a thaler, which afterwards changes into coal, horse-dung, stones, potsherds or tin. She then receives the witch-mark, usually on the back. After being thus thoroughly initiated, she is carried by the devil to various devilish gatherings. The ointment with which the witches anointed themselves and their pitchforks was composed of strange ingredients. Thus on Walpurgis night the body of a child was exhumed near a chapel, cut up and taken to a house in Bamberg where it was boiled and mixed with other substances into a salve, which was distributed among the witches. On Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, between 11 and 12 P.M., they went, usually in couples, through the chimney, either on a pitchfork or a stick or mounted on a goat or horse, in the name of the devil—that is, they used the formula, "Ich fahr' aus in Teufel's Namen und nirgends an." Sometimes three or four flew on one stick, headed by an incubus. The gathering places for those of Bamberg were on the Staffelberg, the Elmerspitze, the Hauptsmoorwald, the Kaulberg, the Altenburg, the Kaisershof, Roppach bei Hallstadt, by the Friedrichsbrunnen, under the linden on the Michaelsberg, and many other places. Even the council-chamber of the prince-bishop was used for gatherings of the higher classes—bürgermeisters and councillors. In 1666 a boy spoke of going to the Venusberg.—Ib., pp. 27–9.

In these gatherings appeared persons who had already been burnt. They were presided over by a demon of high rank, who was adored by his subjects. During the dances he sat on a chair and entered in a red book the names of those

present. The commands he laid on them were cruel—to kill their children and men and cattle, and when they disobeyed he beat them; and by his orders, rarely men, but often horses and cows were killed, men and women injured and harvests damaged. Witches were accustomed to change themselves into toads when about to do evil. As Sibylla Schneidin said, when a toad is found in a house, it is a witch and should be killed, and then the witch dies. Often the demon himself kills the children of his devotees. Witches were allowed to go to confession, but on condition of giving to the devil the consecrated hosts received in communion.—Ib., pp. 29–30.

The devil foresaw the arrest of his people and usually visited them a few days in advance, told them of it and comforted them with promises of assistance. He also visited them in prison and either laughed at them or ordered them to keep silent. At the audiences he would sit under the table and make faces at them or threaten them, if they did not maintain silence.—Ib., p. 30.

It should be borne in mind that much of all this is expressed in a simple "Ja" of the accused in reply to questions prepared beforehand by the judges. All the trials are of the same pattern.—Ib., pp. 30–1.

It is thus easy to understand the conformity of the confessions, on which so much weight is laid by the demonographers.

Bamberg enjoys the doubtful honor of being among the cities in which by far the greatest proportional witch-persecutions took place and where the executions were most numerous. The prince-bishopric likewise took the lead in legislation, of all the German States, and here the bull of Innocent VIII and the Malleus were especially respected. The Bambergische Halsgerichtsordnung, redacted by Johann von Schwarzenberg in 1507, under the wise and humane bishop Georg III von Limburg, has three articles on sorcery. Art. cxxxi says that whoever works injury by sorcery shall be put to death by fire, as in heresy. If a man uses sorcery without doing harm he shall be punished according to circumstances, and the judges shall act "als von Rathsuchen geschrieben steht." In practice, however, the judges departed from this humane provision and not only adopted the developed theory of witchcraft in the Malleus, but put in force the doctrine that witchcraft rested on apostasy from God and was in itself a crime to be visited with fire.—Ib., p. 31.

The acts of the processes show that no means were shrunk from to extirpate witches. The procedure was borrowed from the Inquisition. In all places confidential men were ordered to observe whether there were any suspicious persons. In the Bamberg territory this function was performed by the Stadtvögte, and many of them—as those of Kronach and Weismain—developed great dexterity. According to the later universal practice, the judges were empowered to proceed against the suspect on a simple denunciation, ill-fame and other *indicia*. Denunciation was open to all and it was easy to get rid of enemies.—Ib., p. 32.

As soon as a person was denounced, the process began. A letter to the Stadtvogt of Steinwiesen shows that on the arrest for witchcraft the Vogt was ordered to examine the house and stable carefully in every place, chimney, under the bed, in chests, for suspicious articles, such as pitchforks, ointment, bundles of herbs, etc., and report minutely about them. Then comes the examination of the accused and the executioner is ordered to examine her for suspicious marks, but not to let her know that he is doing so. If the judge had the requisite preliminary *indicia* he could open the process. Everything could serve as proof sufficient to begin. In the presence of the accused the prosecutor—usually a secular councillor of the prince-bishop—presented a brief accusation, stating that she was brought to trial for sorcery, and asked that the case be duly weighed, so that she be judged and punished according to law. If she had been accused by other prisoners under torture, their testimony was carefully collated and the judge added to it such comments as he deemed important, as for instance, "Diese Frau ist lutherisch."—Ib., p. 33.

This was laid before the official prosecutor; the accused was brought in, and if she denied, usually but not always one of the witnesses was confronted with her and told of the places and acts in which she had seen the accused, while the latter was urged to confess voluntarily and thus escape torture. If she persisted in asserting her innocence, her clothes were removed and the *Drudenkittel*, or witch-frock, was put on her. Frequently this brought a confession; but, if not, the executioner was called in and she was warned to confess the unvarnished truth. If she was silent, torture commenced with the thumbscrew, the *Beinschraube* (boot?—yes, *Spanische Stiefel*—see Cod. Crim. Theresian., xlvi—H. C. L.),

scourging with rods, hoisting on the ladder and other resources of torture, during which she is repeatedly examined upon all the *indicia* against her. In Bamberg, however, the torture sometimes began with the ladder, on which she was severely scourged; if this did not suffice, the thumbscrew and boot were applied together. There was also the *Bock*, or stocks furnished with iron points, on which she was placed and kept sometimes for hours. Jakob Krauss, a burger of Zeil, was kept there for $5\frac{3}{4}$ hours and then doused with cold water. (This is not in the Theresiana.—H. C. L.) Also the *Zug* (strappado), in which she was sometimes hung for an hour, or until her faintness shocked even the executioner. Especially obstinate witches were also treated with cold water baths, or the *Schwefelfedern* were employed, by which burning sulphur was dropped on the body, or the burning feathers were held under the arms or other parts of the body. Another method used in Bamberg was called the *Betstuhl*, or prayer-stool, in which the patient was made to kneel on a board furnished with sharp wooden pegs. In cases where no confession was extracted, the torture was prolonged for thirteen days. When the weak condition of the tortured threatened death, it was postponed for days and even months. But in spite of this in Bamberg there were cases enough of death during and after torture. A Frau von Weismann, seventy-four years old, after prolonged torture, on her way back to prison fell down and expired; it was not admitted that torture caused her death, but recorded that, if she had not died, she would have been acquitted. It is very impressive how some, trusting in God, overcame the severest torture, while others begged to be told what to confess, which they would willingly do.—Ib., pp. 33–6.

Some days later the accused was brought in *banco juris* and made to declare that the confession was confirmed of free-will and without constraint and that she would live and die by it, so help her God and the saints.—Ib., p. 36.

The number of accomplices named under torture is often shockingly large—many enumerate 50, 60 or even over 100.—Ib., p. 36.

The *Drudenzeichen*, or witch-mark, was sought for and any wart or mark was tested with the *Nadelprobe* and, if it gave no pain and drew no blood, it was deemed to be genuine. Absence of tears under torture was also a very serious proof and was always recorded in the protocol. Another proof

was the inability of the accused to recite the Paternoster.—Ib., p. 37.

When the proceedings were concluded, then came the sentence. This was preceded by a prayer for mercy addressed to the judge and assessors by one of the inquisitors, who represented that the poor sinner had confessed the misdeeds of which she was accused and to which she had been led by inborn human weakness and especially by Satan, the Evil Spirit, who as a waylayer of intelligent creatures had perverted her. From the bottom of her heart she grieved and repented and would willingly endure a temporal punishment to save her soul and therefore begged the Richter and Schöpffen for the sake of God to pardon her sins and misdeeds and pass a merciful judgment on her.—Ib., pp. 37–8.

Those who were not sentenced to death had to take the *Urfehde*. Specimen is that of Anna Wölffin, November 24, 1627, sentenced to scourging and exile from the Bamberg territory. She acknowledged that the prince-bishop was justified in her arrest and imprisonment, and exonerates by name all those who were concerned in her trial, guaranteeing them against injury from her heirs. The document is long and elaborate.—Ib., pp. 38–9.

An old woman of ninety-five from Neusse, who had endured all tortures with wonderful heroisim and constantly asserted her innocence, was discharged and sent to Weismain to perform penance to be assigned to her by the priests.—Ib., p. 39.

A sentence rendered at Zeil, March 10, 1629, on one man and eight women condemns them all to be burnt alive. Moreover as Gertraut Stöltzin had taken the host from her mouth and dishonored it four times and Kunigunda Albertin, Margaretha Pannacherin and Catherina Weyherin had done so once, they were to be torn with red-hot pincers an equivalent number of times. Also, as the said Stöltzin and Barbara Pertelmenin had each murdered one of her children, they should each have for it two applications of the pincers. Also, as the said Pertelmenin and Kunigunda Albertin had each put another's child to death, they should for this each receive one application. (Thus the Stöltzin had six grips of the pincers, Weyherin one, Albertin two, Barbara Pertelmenin three and Pannacherin one.—H. C. L.)—Ib., pp. 40–1.

A *Gnadenzettel* announces that, although the culprits present had been justly condemned to burning alive, the prince in mercy decrees that they shall be first beheaded. Two of them,

however, on account of special misdeeds are first to have each one grip of the red-hot pincers and their right hands to be cut off and burnt with them.—Ib., p. 41.

Usually on the last page of the process, where the execution of the sentence is recorded, we find a note as to whether the culprit died repentant or not. Also at the end of the protocol there rarely is lacking an addition as to the *Dominus Confessarius*. A specimen of this is one appended to the case of Anna Hansen, June 17, 1629, which says that the *Dn. Confessarius*, R. P. Petrus Kircher, S. J., reported nothing as to her revoking her evidence as to her accomplices, although he was specially asked about it and was accustomed to it, "quare minime dubito quin ob id ipsum ejus denunciationibus sit tanto major adhibenda fides."—Ib., p. 41; App., p. x.

Witchcraft had wide extension in Bamberg. It began to be important already in the time of Prince-Bishop Gottfried von Aschhausen (1609–22) and reached its culmination under Johann Georg II Fuchs von Dornheim (1623–33). During that time there were at least 900 executions. One would willingly believe this an exaggeration; but when one reflects that a pamphlet printed in Bamberg in 1659 asserts the execution of 600 persons under Johann Georg alone, the number seems too small rather than too large.[1]

The Bamberg persecution would hardly have had such development but for the fierce witch-persecutor Friedrich Förner, the suffragan and general vicar, who was assisted by the doctors *Utriusque Juris* composing the bishop's secular council, among whom Dr. Vasold distinguished himself especially. They discharged their functions according to the spirit of the Malleus.—Ib., p. 42.

The "Hexenbischof", Johann Georg, built a *Drudenhaus*, of which not a trace remains, but it probably occupied what is now a garden known as the *Drudengarten*. Old prints show that it was large and massive, with an image of Justice over the entrance and the Virgilian line "Discite justitiam moniti et non temnere divos," while tablets on either side of the portal bore the significant text I Chron., ix, 8–9, and its translation. The torture chamber was separate, but connected by a walled

[1] Yet more does the number seem too small when one reads not only the "sechshundert" of the pamphlet's title, but the wording of its text: ". . . und seyndt in dem Stifft Bamberg über die sechshundert Zauberinen verbrannt worden, der noch täglich viel eingelegt und verbrannt werden." This pamphlet was clearly compiled in 1629, while the persecution was in full tide; but the arrests ceased in July, 1630. The pamphlet (reprinted in Hauber, Bibl. Mag., III, pp. 441–49) does not mention Johann Georg, saying only "Der Bischoff zu Bamberg."—B.

court, and a brook ran under it. There was also a chapel building. The number of prisoners that it would accommodate may be guessed from the provision accounts, which show that there were usually thirty confined at a time (Leitschuh, pp. 43–5). But this was by no means the total for the province; for Zeil, where cruel persecution occurred, must have had a similar building, and there were such in Hallstadt, Kronach and other places. The prisoner or her friends had to furnish all necessaries—beds and bedding, utensils, etc. At the time of arrest a minute and comprehensive inventory was made of all possessions of the accused, with valuations on everything, and all moneys and debts due. The confiscations which ordinarily ensued became so oppressive that the Emperor Ferdinand II, whose attention was called to it by complaints, expressly forbade it to the Bamberg Prince-Bishop.—Ib., pp. 45–6.

The treatment of the prisoners seems to have varied. In a list of provisions furnished for the week March 5–11, 1628, for eleven prisoners the fare each day shows soup, meat, fish, and vegetables of one kind or another. Probably these were wealthy and paid for their meals. Then for four others the fare is less full and varied, while nine others are listed as receiving only bread and water. These latter were not those who had resisted torture and were treated harshly to coerce them to confession by slow torture, for two of them are noted as arrested on March 7. Probably they were poor and were kept at the public expense. In another statement of the expenses for a month in the Bamberg *Hexenhaus* there is an item of 8 florins, 16 kreuzer, for the maintenance of many prisoners. Also an item of 3 gulden for washing their clothes —which probably they paid for.—Ib., pp. 46–7.

The oldest women, girls of seven and men of the highest station were not spared. The chancellor of the bishop, Dr. Georg Haan, his wife Ursula and his son Dr. Georg Adam Haan expired at the stake. Five bürgermeisters of Bamberg, Johannes Junius, Georg Neudecker (he had been one of the four bürgermeisters of Bamberg uninterruptedly from 1612 till his arrest, April 28, 1628, p. 54), Daniel Bayer, Jakob Dittmayer and Albert Richter were burnt. Numerous Rathsherren shared the same fate and Michael Köstner, Chaplain of St. Martin. Even the fierce Suffragan, Friedrich Förner, and some of the judges of the witches were accused, but the benighted "Hexen-Präceptoren" decided that these assertions were dictated by the devil and were therefore lies.—Ib., p. 48.

Johannes Junius had been either Rathsherr or Bürgermeister from 1608 until 1628, when he was arrested. He managed, July 24, 1628, to write to his daughter Veronica a letter, telling her to give to the bearer a thaler, and to keep it secret or his guards will be beheaded (showing that the prisoners were kept incommunicado—H. C. L.). In the letter he gives a most affecting account of his trial; he bids her a last farewell, as he is doomed to die, and begs for her prayers and those of his other daughter Anna Maria, a nun. At his first audience, his brother-in-law, Dr. Braun of Abtswerth, on the bench, asked him how he came to be there; he replied, "Through falsehood and misfortune." Braun retorted, "You are a wizard; will you confess it willingly? If not, witnesses will be brought and you will be handed over to the executioner." He replied, "I am no wizard, I cannot if there are a thousand witnesses, but I will willingly hear them." Then the chancellor's son, Dr. Haan, was brought, who said he had seen him. Junius asked that he be sworn and legally examined, but Braun refused. Then the Chancellor, Dr. Georg Haan, was brought, who said the same as his son. Then a female laborer named Else, who said she had seen him dance in the Hauptsmorwald, but they refused to swear her. He was told that he must confess or the torturer would be summoned. He refused, and the thumbscrew was applied to both thumbs so that the blood spirted from his nails and for four weeks he could not use his hands. As he refused to confess, he was hoisted eight times in the strappado till he thought heaven and earth were passing away. He said, "God forgive you for thus misusing an innocent and honorable man," to which Braun retorted, "Thou art a knave." This occurred June 30. As the executioner was conducting him back to his cell he begged him for the sake of God to confess something, whether true or false; that he could not endure the torture that would be used, again and again, until he confessed. Then came Georg, who said the commissioners had said the Prince-Bishop wished to make such an example of him as would astonish the people. As the result of this he asked for time to consider, and a priest. The time was conceded, but not the priest; and he finally framed a story which he sets forth, telling his dearest child that it is a falsehood, to escape insufferable torment. In his meadow by the Friedrichsbrunnen he was sitting in much trouble when a girl came and asked what was his grief. He replied that he did not know, when she suddenly changed to a goat, seized him by the throat and said, "You must be mine

or I will destroy you." She disappeared and returned with two women and three men and forced him to renounce God, baptized him and gave him a ducat which changed to a potsherd. This did not suffice; with the torturer at his side he had to tell of the Sabbats he had attended. He named the places mentioned by the witnesses in their confrontation, and was then required to tell whom he had seen. On his saying he recognized none, the judge exclaimed, "You old knave, I must put the torturer to your throat. Was not the chancellor there?" He said, "Yes." "Who more?" He answered he did not know any one. He was then told to take one street after another in the town and was questioned about the people, but he knew no one as accomplice, not even the Bürgermeister Dittmeyer, whom they suggested. Then he was handed over to the torturer—"Hoist the knave up." Then he confessed that he had tried to kill his children and had killed a horse. This did not help and he added that he had taken a host and buried it, and this satisfied them. "Now, my dearest child," he adds, "you have here all my acts and confession, for which I must die; it is all falsehood and invention, so help me God. I have done this out of dread of further torture added to the former. They never cease the torture until one says something. Be he as pious as he will, he must be a wizard; no one leaves here, were he even a count. If God sends no means of bringing the truth to light, our whole kindred will be burnt. God in heaven knows that I know not the smallest thing. I die innocent and as a martyr." And he counsels his daughter to collect all her money and absent herself for six months on a pilgrimage, or as long as may be necessary.[1]—Ib., pp. 49–55.

It is a voice from the depths. He has no reproaches for those who have so foully and cruelly used him; he merely states the facts to exonerate himself in the eyes of his loved ones and resigns himself to the fiery death which he knows to be inevitable. The very incoherencies of some passages assure the authenticity of what is written under so awful a strain of mind and body.

In Leitschuh's Appendix is printed the official record of the trial of Junius. It agrees substantially with his own account, except that after the thumbscrew the *Beinschrauben* was applied and that in both he felt no pain. Then prior to the strap-

[1] A translation of this letter into English will be found in the University of Pennsylvania's *Translations and Reprints*, vol. III, No. 4, and a photographic facsimile of two of its pages in the revised edition of Soldan-Heppe (1911).

pado he was examined for the witch-mark and one was found on his right side, shaped like a trefoil; it was thrice pricked without sensation or drawing blood. No mention is made of torture threatened or applied on July 5, when he made his confession, but it is recorded as "in der güte." His meeting with the demon was in 1624 in his "Baumfeld" and the cause of his melancholy then was the trouble he was in about the contested 600 florins arising from his commission to Rothweil. When the maiden changed to a goat, she threatened to twist his neck if he did not surrender to her. When she seized him by the throat, he said "God help me;" then she disappeared but returned with others, who forced him to deny God and baptized him. He was named Krix and his succuba[1] Füchssin. At the baptism were present Christina Morhaubtin, the young Geisslerin, Paul Glasser and Caspar Wittich and Claus Gebhard, who were both gardeners. (Some of these were duly arrested and tried.—H. C. L.) His succuba promised to give him money and to take him to the Sabbat at times. Then a black dog would come to his bed and tell him to come; he would mount it and fly. Gives the names of twenty-seven others whom he saw in an assembly. At another audience, July 7, he names four others. His succuba gave him a gray powder to kill his youngest son; as it was hard on him, he used it on his own horse. The succuba also repeatedly urged him to kill his two daughters, but he refused and was beaten therefor. Burying of a host. Was obliged occasionally to cohabit with his succuba. Eight days before his arrest the demon in shape of a goat warned him of it, but told him not to mind it, as he would soon be liberated. Then on August 6 Junius ratifies his confession and says he will live and die by it. The record ends here.—Ib., Append., pp. i–vi.

On December 5, 1630, the suffragan Friedrich Förner died. Leitschuh bears testimony to his many merits apart from his fanatical persecution of witchcraft. What this owed to him is seen by the fact that in 1631 the injustice of the proceedings was admitted. A document of this year (evidently compiled in April, 1631), written in the same hand as some of the protocols of the trials, is entitled "Designatio welche Personhen im abscheulichen Hexenhaus zu Bamberg bezigtigter Veneficii halben (ausser etlich hundtert hingerichten) noch

[1] In these notes on witchcraft in Franconia (among the latest we have from his pen) Mr. Lea departs from his habit (see above, p. 152, note) and writes "succuba" instead of "succubus."

jämmerlich enthalten unndt unschuldig ellendtlich gequellt werden." On the back is endorsed a similar inscription, with the addition, "Auch der confiscirten Haab undt Guetter," which is very significant. The list gives the date of arrest and the time each one has been in prison and been tortured, varying from three years to seven months—also their estimated wealth. There are in all twenty-two names, nearly all of them persons of considerable property, showing the danger of wealth in such times. The first name is that of Georg Neudecker, a burgher worth 100,000 florins. Then come Barbara Schleuchin, 2000 fl.; the Widow Christina Miltenbergerin, 9000 or 10,000 fl.; Margareta Ofelerin, 7000 or 8000; Margareta Edelwertin, 10,000; Caspar Cörner, Vogt of Münchsberg, 9000 or 10,000; Wolfgang Hoffmeister, treasurer of the prince-bishop, 50,000 (he is the latest on the list, arrested July 24, 1630—probably the persecution ceased soon afterwards—H. C. L.). Then follow twelve persons lying in the "Hexenhaus" of Zeil, of whom five are stated to be crippled by torture. Of those named both in Bamberg and Zeil some, but who is unknown, have been secretly put to death through torture. Besides these, the names of fourteen (not included in the lists) are given who had perished through unheard-of tortures—feeding on herring cooked with salt and pepper and all drink withheld—or starved—or bathed in scalding water with lime, salt, pepper, etc.—killed without law or sentence. The names of six are given who perished in the hot bath and seven in other modes. Also an old serving maid killed with other inhuman tortures and others whom the "Hexen Präceptores am besten wissen."—Ib., pp. 56–9.

It is not at present known, says the document of 1631, that the property of these prisoners still lying in the Hexenhaus has been confiscated, but it is public knowledge that the executed citizens (of whom there were almost 600 persons in Bamberg and Zeil) had property taken and collected by the prince-bishop and his officials amounting to over 500,000 florins. In addition to this the confiscated property of those still in prison in April, 1631, is estimated at 222,000 fl.—Ib., pp. 59–60.

It would seem that the convicts were allowed to make wills (though in view of confiscation this might seem superfluous—H. C. L.). In these there are generally full bequests to churches and convents. It was probably in hopes of having their last wishes fulfilled that a document shows legacies of

from 1 to 10 florins left to the notary by seven of those condemned at Zeil.—Ib., p. 60, and Append., p. xvi.

In a chronicle written by Maria Anna Junius, nun of the convent of the Holy Sepulchre and daughter of the bürgermeister whom we have seen burnt, it is recorded under 1627 that at Zeil a newly discovered witch was burnt who confessed that she had frozen everything the year previous, which inflamed the prince, who caused the arrest of prominent people, who were taken to Zeil and burnt. He had also built a prison which was called the Drudenhaus. The first imprisoned there were the innocent children of the Chancellor, his daughter and two wives of bürgermeisters, after whom nearly all the foremost people were imprisoned and finally led to the Black Cross (the place of execution?), among whom were many prominent, handsome maidens and young fellows. "Ob nun allen Recht geschehen ist, allein Gott bewusst." This burning continued into the year 1631, when the enemy came to Bamberg, where there were still ten persons in the Drudenhaus who had lain there more than a year and a day. These were discharged, but had to take an oath to say nothing of what had been done to them.—Ib., pp. 60–1.

Thus it appears that the cessation of the persecution was due more to the coming of the Swedes than to the death of Suffragan Friedrich Förner. Doubtless this also explains the contemporary cessation of persecution in Würzburg. Gustavus Adolphus's victory over Tilly at Breitenfeld near Leipzig was September 17, 1631, after which he advanced to the Rhine. In 1632 he entered Munich. [Before the arrival of the Swedes, as later students agree, imperial pressure had halted the arrests—in July, 1630.—B.]

A sample trial is that of Anna Hansen, wife of the burgher Schreiner of Zeil. June 17, 1629, by ten votes she is imprisoned. First audience June 18: admonished to confess, with strange and wild gestures she declared that she did not know what a witch was. Is scourged with rods. June 20, the *Daumenstock* is applied. Apparently this brings a confession, though not recorded. Then, June 28, her confession is carefully read over to her and she is earnestly warned and entreated that, if she had done injustice to herself or to others, she should now make it known to avoid eternal damnation, since she persisted in it when she had been *peculiariter* tortured with the thumbscrew. On June 30, before the judge and four Schöpffen she voluntarily confirmed her confession. The same day, before noon, the court rendered verdict that she

should be burnt alive. July 4 she is informed that the 7th is assigned as her Rechtstag. July 7, with the foreknowledge (*Vorwissen*) of the prince-bishop, the above judgment is published at the Rathhaus and immediately is executed at the appropriate place, but with the mitigation of first beheading. "Hujus anima requiescat in sancta pace. Amen."—Ib., Append., pp. ix–x.

From this it would appear that sentences were submitted to the prince-bishop for confirmation.

This bald record is suggestive of the speedy routine with which these cases were dispatched.

A petition to the Kaiser from Barbara Hanssen [Schwarz, wife of Hans Schwarz], Gastgeber, of Bamberg represents that a neighbor with whom she had a quarrel denounced her as a witch without giving any details, whereupon she was arrested and carried to Zeil where she was imprisoned for three years and nearly starved on bread and water. Eight times she was tortured with *Daumenstock, Beinschrauben* and scourging, without confession, notwithstanding which she was still detained in contravention of the canons and the Carolina. She managed to file through her chains and escaped to Bamberg, but was again arrested (Leitschuh says at the instance of her husband, because nobody would frequent the tavern while she was there). Now she petitions the Kaiser as the head of Christendom to order the prince-bishop's chancellor and officials to release her under sufficient security to answer any accusations. Without date.—Ib., Append., pp. x–xiii.

There was an active persecution on foot in 1617. In an account for meals furnished on the occasion of executions, it would appear that on August 16 there were 13 persons burnt. Then soon afterwards, but without a date, there is a charge of 1 florin each for "sein ganze Mühewaltung in solcher peinlichen sach" for 28. Then October 18, 1618, there are 4. October 22, 4. Then January 12, 1618, 4. February 7, 4.—Ib., pp. xv–xvi.

Ferdinand II probably had many petitions similar to the above-mentioned one. May 11, 1630, in response to one from Dorothea Flockhin, complaining of being deprived of an advocate, and of harsh imprisonment six weeks after childbed, he orders the Prince-Bishop Johann Georg of Bamberg to observe the rules laid down in the Halsgerichtsordnung (Carolina). This is not the first occasion of his interference with

the lawless procedure in Bamberg, for he refers to previous orders of the same nature.—Ib., Append., pp. xvii–xviii.[1]

The title of the account of prosecutions in Bamberg is worth giving: "Kurtzer und wahrhafftiger Bericht und erschreckliche Neue Zeitung von sechshundert Hexen, Zauberern und Teuffels-Bannern, welche der Bischoff zu Bamberg hat verbrennen lassen, was sie in gütlicher und peinlicher Frage bekannt. Auch hat der Bischoff im Stifft Würtzburg über die neun hundert verbrennen lassen. Und haben etliche hundert Menschen durch ihre Teuffels-Kunst um das Leben gebracht, auch die lieben Früchte auf dem Felde, durch Reiffen und Frost verderbet, darunter nicht alleine gemeine Personen, sondern etliche der vornehme Herrn, Doctor und Doctors-Weiber, auch etliche Raths-Personen, alle hingericht und verbrannt worden: welche so schreckliche Thaten bekannt, das nicht alles zu beschreiben ist, die sie mit ihrer Zauberey getrieben haben, werdet ihr hierinnen allen Bericht finden. Mit Bewilligung des Bischoffs und gantzen Thum-Capitels in Druck gegeben. Gedruckt zu Bamberg, Bey Augustin Czinchium, im Jahr 1659." [Printed in Hauber's Bibliotheca Magica, III, p. 441.]

The perfect delirium of superstition created by the madness of such persecutions is well illustrated by the marvels extorted from the victims and accepted by the credulous community. We are told of a butcher who by sorcery poisoned the pasturage, and, when the cattle died, brought the carcasses into the town, fascinating the people so that they regarded them as living beasts and then sold the meat, which killed those who ate it. There were witches who converted themselves into fiery dragons and flew around. A midwife confessed to killing more than 200 infants by pricking the fontanelle, and another, by smearing her hand with the ointment, slew more than 50 women whom she assisted in labor, with their babes. If a man did not wash his hands on rising, everything he touched, horses, cattle, sheep, could be bewitched so that they dried up like wood. If a room or a house was swept out and the

[1] For the Bamberg witch-trials we have not only the book of Leitschuh and an earlier one (1835) by the Graf von Lamberg, but a study by Dr. Pins Wittmann, "Die Bamberger Hexen-Justiz (1595–1631)," in the *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht*, vol. 50 (1883), pp. 177–223. Looshorn, too, in his *Geschichte des Bistums Bamberg*, devotes to these much of his Bd. VI (1906). But there is in the White Library at Cornell a body of still unexplored Bamberg witch-documents (including three imperial letters). An accompanying letter shows them to have been turned over in 1847 by the Bürgermeister Glaser to the historian G. T. Rudhart as "an antiquarian curiosity."—B.

sweepings were left behind the door, the witch could charm away everything she wished in it—money, eggs, meat, butter, cheese or milk.

In 1629 or thereabouts, according to the Bamberg Neue Zeitung of 1659, the Sabbat held on the Kreydenberg, near Würzburg on Walpurgis night had an assemblage of 3000. There were priests who baptized in the name of the devil and parents who dedicated their unborn children to Satan, so it was not wonderful that young children could make thunder and lightning. This perhaps explains why 22 young girls of seven, eight, nine and ten were burnt. The victims were not confined to the lower classes, but spread to councillors, burgomasters and commensals of the bishop, priests and religious. In one prominent family all the members were burnt save a girl of eighteen. She begged also to be executed, but as she had been conspicuous in good works—pilgrimages, adorning images and the like, for she was rich—the Landvogt desired to merely imprison her for life, but she persisted till she was condemned. She was extremely solicitous as to her salvation; she adorned three altars in the church of the Capuchins and had masses sung for her soul, but fourteen days after her execution she appeared to Father Augustin, Capuchin prior, in the cloister and announced that she was hopelessly damned and masses were useless—and she confirmed this by leaving the imprint of her hand burnt on the door.—Hauber, Bibl. Magic., III, pp. 442–9.

It is easy to conceive of the atmosphere of terror in which the community lived—momentarily expecting to be the victims of the unholy arts of the witches or to be arrested and burnt as accomplices. Under such conditions the faculty of reason was lost in the craze of fear.

Father Ignatz Gropp says of Philipp Adolf v. Ehrenberg, Bishop of Würzburg (1623–31): "Sub Philippo Adolpho Religionis Sanctitatem nova impietate deturpare conatus est hostis animarum infensissimus diabolus, dum perplures earum magiae vitio delusit, infecit ac misere seduxit. Virus sane fortissimum, cui depellendo zelosissimus Praesul ferro usus est et igne, nec ad sanguinem propriae gentis respexit, quem eodem malo infectum sanandi remedium aliud supererat nullum."—Gropp, Collectio Scriptorum et Rerum Wirceburgensium (Francof., 1741, 4), II, p. 148.

His immediate predecessor, Johann Gottfried, was equally zealous. Among the laudations of his funeral oration is: "Magiam, inquam, et veneficia et Daemoniacam Idolo-

maniam, ferro et igne extinctum ivit et infernalem lupum ab ovili suo arcere contendit."—Ib., p. 249.

Philip Adolf must have conducted a bloody persecution, for all eulogies on him refer to it—"Honoris Divini zelator, stygios veneficorum conventus disturbavit, plurimis eorum rogo addictis." "Justitiae strenuus zelator contra crimen magiae Divinam offendens Majestatem severe vindicavit." And again, "Acriori contra magiam censura anno 1628 insurrexit, quod crimen nimium invalescens ferro et igne compescendum censuit, permultis qui eodem infecti fuerant flammarum supplicio extinctis." He was also a zealous persecutor of heresy, with which his diocese was largely infected.—Ib., pp. 282–3.

It is said above that Bishop Adolf did not spare his own blood. This refers to a very remarkable case of which a long account is given by a Jesuit who was a participant. Ernest von Ehrenberg was a youth of remarkable promise, handsome, moral, religious, highly cultivated and studious and beloved by everyone. He was the last of his family, with a brilliant career in prospect. Unfortunately a matron of kin to him fell in love with him and seduced him from the path of virtue and he took to drinking and dissipation "atque ea agere quibus leges ignem decreverunt" (which may possibly from the context mean sodomy rather than sorcery—H. C. L.). In the witch prosecutions evidence was obtained that he had given himself to the demon, frequented the Sabbat, perpetrated homicide and seduced others to the same. The prince-bishop was overcome with grief when this was reported to him and sought to save the youth by handing him over to the Jesuits. He was told that his guilt was absolutely proved and without much tergiversation confessed fully how he had been seduced and the horrid crimes which he had perpetrated. He was taken to the Jesuit college, supplied with Agnus Dei, relics and sacramentalia as armor against the devil and accompanied day and night by members of the Society with prayers and exhortations, all of which he gratefully accepted, "sed profecto nullum est curatu difficilius quam Magiae peccatum." Satan was resolved not to lose him and would come at night and carry him from his bed to the Sabbat, returning him by the fourth hour, at which we are accustomed to rise, but not so silently but that his guardian would sometimes be aware of it, and on questioning him he would with tears and grief admit it and promise reformation. These alternations continued, giving the day to God and the night to the devil, till

there was no hope of his conversion. Then the Franciscans undertook the task with the same result, and the bishop was told that it was labor lost, who with great sorrow ordered the judges to do their duty, whereupon they sentenced him to die the next day. The bishop ordered the Jesuits to prepare him for death and bring him to the castle at 8 o'clock in the morning. At 7 they went to him and found him in bed; he dressed rapidly and asked the reason of this early visit. They said it was only in order that he might lead a better life and that he should accompany them to the castle, which he had better do willingly and not by force. He took his cloak and went with them pleasantly, pointing out various places where he had drunk or danced, but when he was led into a room hung with black and prepared for the execution he clamored for mercy so piteously that all present were affected to tears and appealed to the bishop to spare him. The bishop weighed the matter and after some days sent a prudent man to urge him to repentance, promising to restore him to his old position, if assured of his constancy. But the devil, who spares no promises to keep the souls that he has seduced, so wrought upon him that he said to the envoy, "If you had seen what I have seen, you would become what I am, and if I were not so, I would become so." From this he could not be moved and the bishop renewed the order for the execution. The gloomy chamber was prepared again; Ernest went there with alacrity, but when he entered the same scene was repeated. He clamored for mercy, wrenched himself from the hands of the officials and sought to hide in corners. He was deaf to all exhortations to throw himself on the mercy of God and save his soul from perdition; he was finally beheaded; the executioner seized an opportunity and struck off his head, when he fell dead without giving a sign of repentance. "Utinam non etiam in aeternum rogum cecidisset!"—Ib., pp. 287–91.

This remarkable story evidently has something behind it left untold. Possibly the real offence was heresy rather than sorcery. Protestant writers have no scruple in asserting that the Jesuits, in exterminating heresy during and after the Thirty Years War, made free use of the popular dread of witchcraft to encompass their ends. Soldan-Heppe, who gives a full account of this, says nothing of the kind, but adds that, if Philipp Adolf had not been prince, he would have gone the way of his kinsman, for the accused began to include him and his chancellor as accomplices, when his eyes were opened; the persecution ceased and he instituted with the Augustinians of Würzburg a weekly, quarterly and yearly commemoration of the victims, which Gropp is careful not to relate.—Soldan-Heppe, II, p. 55.

Gropp made a dramatic scene of "Ernestus Veneficus in Carcere et Catenis" for declamation by the students of Heidelberg University.—Gropp, II, pp. 291–8.

The story was also made a feature in a program of the University of Würzburg in 1700.—Soldan-Heppe, II, p. 52.

At Würzburg there was persecution in 1600 under Bishop Julius—a witch-case lasting from January 20 to March 24, 1600, which was closely watched in detail by the bishop, who mercifully ordered strangling before burning. Among the costs was a charge of 163 thäler from two innkeepers. The estate went to the heirs—Diefenbach, Der Hexenwahn vor und nach der Glaubensspaltung in Deutschland (Mainz, 1886), pp. 123–4.

Bishop Philipp Adolf was mercifully inclined, but was compelled by his secular council to cruelties which shame his memory and his office. On May 12, 1626, at Heidingsfeld, a gooseherd was accused of *maleficia*; this led to other prosecutions, resting on peasant and alehouse gossip, but it resulted, December 29, in the sentencing of eight persons to the stake, one of whom was to be torn with red-hot pincers. This was confirmed by the bishop, January 2, 1627, with the condition that the sentence should not be pronounced until the 15th and meanwhile priests should exhort them to repentance and those who repented should be beheaded before burning, while the pincers were to be omitted. Diefenbach gives other cases, among which is that of Dorothea Schneider, tortured without confession and banished July 11, 1628. In January, 1628, ten school-children between eight and twelve years old: eight of them were handed over to the Hausvater for amendment, but two, Sybille Lutzin and Anna Rauschin, eleven and twelve years old, whose reputation was bad, were put to death; the former confessed to sexual relations with an incubus Hämerlein, and the latter with Federlein. Another, named Mürchin, eight and a half years old, did the same. September 27, 1628, the Burgvogt of Dundorf, who had been imprisoned, was released and restored to his office. October 24 a woman named Margaretha, who persistently denied, was banished. A school-boy named J. Philipp Schuck was examined October 28, 1628; he denied and after forty-six stripes still denied, but seventy-seven more brought a full confession, including the Sabbat and the names of accomplices. He held to it and was executed November 9. On the same October 28, Jacob Russ, a boy of twelve, after repeated

scourging, confessed to Sabbat, visiting the wine-cellar of the hospital, etc., and gave the names of accomplices, among whom were priests; he was executed November 10. May 15, 1629, there is an account of the costs for fifteen persons discharged. July 20, 1629, there is a suit of Stein vs. Hügel for defamation of witchcraft; the case was tried fully with witnesses and counsel; Hügel was condemned to 14 days in gaol and 35 thäler fine. After serving his time he petitioned about the fine and the bishop remitted one-half. May 22, 1628, there is a printed summons for Dr. Fr. Burkardt, princely councillor, accused of sorcery, who had fled to Speyer and appealed to the Reichskammergericht, which declined jurisdiction, and nothing was done.—Diefenbach, Der Hexenwahn vor und nach der Glaubensspaltung in Deutschland (Mainz, 1886), pp. 124–7.

These are a few cases selected to illustrate various phases:

In January, 1631, the town of Hagenau sends envoys to represent that in Unter-Elsass and Hagenau witchcraft is so prevalent that they were unable to check it, for the ordinary process by torture effected nothing. They had heard that in the Herzogthum Franken it had been suppressed and well-nigh extirpated, and they ask for instructions from the beginning to the end "über *modus torquendi et executionis.*"—Ib., p. 127.

On October 15, 1631, the rule of the prince-bishop came to an end, for Gustavus Adolphus replaced it with a Swedish organization which continued to 1635. Simultaneously the witch prosecutions ceased.—Ib., p. 127.[1]

In Lindheim in the Wetterau a cruel persecution raged from 1662 to 1668. The mill there was under jurisdiction of the Deanery of Würzburg, and Schüler, the miller, fled to the dean, von Rosenbach, for protection and was warmly received. That Geiss, [the fanatic witch-prosecutor,] was dismissed from office in 1666 can probably be attributed to him.—Ib., p. 128.

In his account of the case of Maria Renata of Unterzell, which belongs to Würzburg, Diefenbach takes care to say that, though sent to the nunnery quite young by her parents, she had already led a free life, for the statement that she had

[1] "Die ersten Protokolle stammen aus Julius' Zeit; 1617 verkündete man von der Kanzel, dass nunmehr 300 dem Feuer überantwortet seien. . . . Die meisten Opfer heischte der Fanatismus unter Philipp Adolf von Ehrenberg (1623–31) d. h. ca. 900 im Bereich des Bistums, hiervon 220 in der Hauptstadt."—Knapp, Die Zenten d. Hochstifts Würzburg, ii (Berlin, 1907), p. 564.

been seduced by Satan in the shape of an officer is too significant to be a mere illusion.—Ib., p. 128.

Diefenbach, *loc. cit.*, gives other materials respecting Würzburg.

Leitschuh prints from a MS. a report from Würzburg, October 28, 1627, that there have in all been burnt there 63 persons for witchcraft—and it gives a list of 28, including rich merchants, prominent citizens, members of council and the wives of such persons ("Vogtinnen"), a girl of twelve. There are also children of twelve in prison who are to be tried again. By this time the witch-craze was no respecter of persons; the rich and influential suffered as well as poor old crones.—Leitschuh, Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hexenwesens in Franken, p. 16.

From another MS.[1] he prints a letter from the Chancellor of Würzburg to a friend in Westphalia in August, 1629. "Before this you thought the witch affair ended, but it has sprung up again in a manner beyond description. There are still 400 in the city, of both sexes and of high and low estate, and even religious, so strongly denounced that they may be arrested at any moment. It is certain that many of the prince's people, of all offices and faculties, must be executed—*ordensleute,* learned members of the supreme court, and its doctors, servants of the city, assessors whom you mostly know; there have been *candidati juris* arrested. My lord has more than forty students who should soon become priests, of whom thirteen or fourteen are said to be wizards. A few days since, a Dean was arrested and two others cited have fled. The notary of our ecclesiastical consistory, a most learned man, was arrested yesterday, and has been tortured, and in one word a third of the city is certainly involved; the richest, handsomest, most prominent of the spirituality are already executed. Eight days ago a maiden of nineteen was executed, of whom it is said she was the handsomest, most modest and chastest in the town. In seven or eight days the other best and handsomest persons will follow her. Such persons go in fresh mourning undauntedly to death; there is no trace of fear of the fire. Many are executed for denying God and attending the Sabbat who have else injured no one. In conclusion of this lamentable matter, there are some 300 children of three or four years who have had intercourse with demons. I have seen children of seven executed, brave scholars of ten,

[1] *Codex german.* 1254 of the Munich library.

twelve, fourteen and fifteen years. I can write no more about this misery. There will be yet higher persons whom you know and admire, nay you can hardly believe it true. *Fiat justitia. . . .*" He was not an unbeliever, for he adds:

"P. S. A very wonderful and shocking thing has occurred, for it is certain that in a place called "der Fraw Rengberg" the living devil held an assemblage of 8000 of his followers and celebrated white mass and supplied his hearers (that is, wizards and witches) with turnip-parings and slices in place of the Holy Supper, which is not only the worst but the most hateful blasphemy, which it rends me to write. It is also true that they pledged themselves not to be enrolled in the Book of Life, but all covenanted and said that this should be recorded by a notary who is well known to me and my people. We hope to secure the book in which they are inscribed, which is being earnestly searched for."—Ib., pp. 17–19.

This worthy is "Cancellarius Wirtzburgensis"—I suppose chancellor to the prince-bishop.

A list dated February 16, 1629, of 29 burnings at Würzburg aggregates 160, or $5\frac{1}{2}$ at each holocaust. The writer adds that two more had subsequently taken place and that there had been numerous previous ones. With few exceptions all had been beheaded before burning. Among the victims are 3 boys of ten and 7 of twelve, 1 girl of nine or ten and her sister still younger, and 1 of twelve. A peculiarity of the list is that there are nearly as many men as women. Many are officials civil and spiritual; there are 5 Chor-Herren (canons), a doctor of theology, several vicars, a cathedral provost; the governor of the hospital, a most learned man; a student qualified as an excellent musician, vocal and instrumental; several of the men are spoken of as wealthy.—Snell, pp. 50–5, and Hauber, Bibl. Mag., III, pp. 808–14.

No rank in life was spared. It was as easy for the victim under torture when asked whom she saw at the Sabbat to name the most eminent as the poorest, and no one was above suspicion.[1]

Gesta Trevirorum. Ed. Wyttenbach et Müller, Aug. Treviror., 1839.

[1] It was at this point that Mr. Lea's pen was interrupted by death. The sheets containing these notes on the witch-persecution at Bamberg and at Würzburg were left on his desk, between the leaves of the book from which he had been drawing his materials—the third volume of Hauber's *Bibliotheca, Acta et Scripta Magica* (Lemgo, 1741). They lay between pp. 362 and 363, where the book had been closed on them. The pages with which he had last been busied were the last of this volume and of Hauber's work—pp. 807–14, containing the list of the witches burned at Würzburg. It was like him thus to finish a task before surrendering to the illness which, four days later, ended his life.

The writer in the *Gesta* [the canon Linden] unluckily gives no year, but under Archbishop Johann v. Schönenburg he says of the witch-craze of 1586 sqq.:—

"Quia vulgo creditum est, multorum annorum continuatam sterilitatem a strigibus et maleficis diabolica invidia causari; tota patria in extinctionem maleficarum insurrexit. Hunc motum juvabant multi officiati, ex hujusmodi cineribus aurum et divitias sperantes. Unde tota dioecesi in oppidis ac villis per tribunalia currebant selecti accusatores, inquisitores, apparitores, scabini, judices, lictores, qui homines utriusque sexus trahebant in causam et quaestiones, ac magno numero exurebant. Vix aliquis eorum, qui accusati sunt, supplicium evasit. Nec parcitum fuit magistratibus in urbe Trevirensi. Nam praetor (i. e. Schultheiss, chief magistrate) cum duobus consulibus, senatoribus aliquot et scabinis incinerati sunt. Canonici diversorum collegiorum, parochi, decani rurales in eadem fuere damnatione. Tandem eousque furentis populi et judicum insania processerat, sanguinem et praedam sitientium, ut vix inventus fuerit qui non aliqua hujus sceleris macula notaretur. Interim notarii, actuarii et caupones ditescebant. Carnifex generoso equo instar aulici nobilis ferebatur, auro argentoque vestitus: uxor ejus vestium luxu certabat cum nobilioribus. Supplicio affectorum liberi exulabant; bona publicabantur. Deficiebat arator et vinitor; hinc sterilitas. Vix putatur saevior pestis aut atrocior hostis peragrasse Trevirensium fines, quam hic immodicae inquisitionis et persecutionis modus. Plurima apparebant argumenta non omnes fuisse noxios.

"Durabat haec persecutio complures annos et nonnulli qui justitiae praeerant gloriabantur in pluralitate palorum ad quorum singulos singula humana corpora Vulcano tradita. Tandem, cum haec sentina assiduo Vulcano non exhauriretur, depauperarentur autem subditi, leges inquisitionibus et inquisitoribus eorumque quaestui et sumptibus latae et exercitae sunt; subitoque, sicut in bello, deficiente pecuniae nervo, cessavit impetus inquirentium.

"Observatum fuit, paucos opes ex hac laniena corrasas ad tertios haeredes transtulisse." "Tum quidam poeta Treviricus hos versus fecit:

> "Nullibi tuta fides erat, omnia plena timore,
> Omnia plena rogis, ac omnia plena rapinis
> Esse videbantur. Non relligionis avitae,
> Non vel amicitiae, prisci nec foederis ullus
> Respectus, legum nec forma superfuit usquam."—
>
> Ib., c. ccci (III, pp. 53–5).

The following are from the notes of the editors on this passage.

A decree of the town council, October 1, 1592, published in an edict of the Archbishop, removed all disabilities from the children of those burnt and permitted the return of those exiled.—Ib., p. 54, n. 1.

An Ordinance of Archbishop Johann of 1591 prescribes for the procurator and notary a daily wage of 31 blancs and for the executioner with his assistant 1½ florins.—Ib., n. 2.

I suppose this explains the remark in the narrative that the cutting down of gains put an end to the zeal of the officials.

A protocol of Klaud von Musiel, Schöffe of Trier, gives a list of more than 1000 persons accused or suspect of sorcery. It shows, moreover, that in about twenty *pagi* near to Trier, between 1587 and 1593, 368 persons were burnt.[1] This does not include those within the limits of the city.—Ib., n. 3.

I cannot find any better translation of the vague term *pagus* than district.

Another MS. chronicle says, "Anno 1585 dioecesis Trev. purgatur a sagis tam severe, ut in duobus pagis duae tantum mulieres superstites fuerint." Again, "Anno 1589 Treviris quidam Senator et Juris Licentiatus, nomine Joannes Flade, afficitur supplicio magiae debito, post seriam dehortationem a curiositate"—on which the editors remark that Flade's name was not Johann, but Dietrich, [and that, instead of a "Senator et Juris Licentiatus," he was the city's Judge, a J. U. D., and in 1586 Rector of its University.]—Ib., Append., p. 18.

An inventory of his confiscated property was made in 1590 by Wilhelm Bidburg, the notary. Of this a sum of 4000 florins which he had lent to the city was distributed in 1590 by the Archbishop to the parish churches.—Ib., p. 18.

I suppose Burr has exhausted this. If not, see Hauber, Bibl. Mag., II, p. 583.[2]

[1] On this "protocol"—it is a MS. volume of some 600 4° pp.—see note on pp. 20–1 of my *Flade*. Müller, one of the editors of the *Gesta Trev.*, has devoted a separate study to it (*Kleiner Beitrag zur Geschichte des Hexenwesens*, 1830). The figure 368 for those burnt is a misprint for 308; and, as two are counted twice, the real number is 306. The "pagi" meant are only those belonging to the abbey of St. Maximin, and the number given is not of those *executed*, but of those whose accusations under torture are here listed. Few such, however, escaped death. As to this MS., the St. Maximin witch-register, see my *Flade*, p. 20, *note*.—B.

[2] Perhaps no better illustration could be found of Mr. Lea's scrupulous guarding of his scholarly independence than his approach to this subject of witchcraft at Trier. In mentioning my own name he is thinking of my study on "The Fate of Dietrich Flade" (in vol. v of the *Papers* of the American Historical Association) and of my promise therein (p. 9, note) to write further on the witch-persecution at Trier. The volumes of Hauber, to which he would next turn, were those on which he was at work when death found him.—B.

Archbishop Johann recognized at last the abuses of torture in these trials and issued an edict, December 18, 1591, "Ordinatio Electoralis de modo procedendi adversus sagas et maleficos," in which the indiscriminate use of torture was forbidden and the observance of the Carolina was prescribed. In this he complained that the purses of widows had been emptied by the legal officials, seditions and hatreds had been excited in many places between citizens and peasants, innocent and guilty confounded, many rashly committed to the flames and frequently the executioner made the judge of the case.—Ib., append., p. 19.

"Anno 1593, Cornelius Loseus,[1] patronus causae sagarum, cogitur ad palinodiam a reverendissimo domino Petro Binsfeldt, Suffraganeo Trevirensi, Reinero Biwer, Abbate S. Maximini, Bartholomaeo Bodeghemio, Officiali Trevirensi, Georgio Helffenstein, S.T.D., et Joanne Collmann, J.U.D., commissariis."—Ib., c. ccci (III, p. 58).

"Anno 1598 reverendissimus dominus Petrus Binsfeldt[2] Suffraganeus moritur peste et sepelitur ad St. Simeonem."—Ibidem.

Loos was born in Gouda, Holland. Living at Trier, by speech and writing he combated the persecution of witches, exposing himself to no little danger, which he could only escape by a *palinodia*. Given in custody to the abbey of St. Maximin by order of the papal nuncio, before the commissioners on March 15, 1593, he abjured his opinions and admitted that he had erred and lied: it was his only means of regaining liberty. Returning to his native land, he reverted to his former opinions and was thrown in prison, but death put an end to his prosecution.—Ib., append., p. 19.

Hennen, Gerhard.—*Ein Hexenprozess aus der Umgegend von Trier aus dem Jahre 1572.* [Trier], "Selbstverlag.", 1887.

A few cases will exhibit the rapidity with which the trials were conducted.

	Arrested.	*Executed.*
Bach Theis of Oberemmel .	Nov. 7, 1588	Nov. 14, 1588
Margaretha Krisams Josten of Longuich	Feb. 23, 1588	Mar. 3, 1588
Maria Beilen of Issel . .	Mar. 6, 1588	Mar. 11, 1588
Steinen Barbara of Fell .	Apr. 18, 1589	Apr. 22, 1589
Welters Engel of Kenn . .	June 2, 1589	June 10, 1589

Ib., pp. 4–5.

[1] On Loos, see also p. 601 ff. above.
[2] On Binsfeld, see p. 576 ff.

In this persecution it was in the highest degree dangerous to attempt to defend the accused. If the priest attested the good character of one of his parishioners he was at once regarded as an accomplice, with the result of losing his own life. Thus perished Pastor Jost of Büdelich in 1593; Johann Malmunder, Abbot of St. Martin in 1590; Dean Peter Homphaeus at Pfalzel in 1591; Dean Christian at Waldrach in 1590; Dean Schweich at Longuich in 1589; Pastor Johann Waltrach at Mehring in 1588; Pastor Johann Raw at Fell, and many others.—Ib., p. 11.

Hennen gives details of a witch-trial which shows that the outbreak of 1586 was not the first. Eva of Kenn is the accused. (She is on trial for child-murder, proved by witnesses—see remarks at end.—H. C. L.) She is tortured in the morning without much result. At 3 P.M. she is brought back. At first she says that she knows no sorcery, but she knows well that her life is forfeit and is indifferent whether she is burnt or buried alive. Tortured again, at first with little result. A higher grade of torture is employed, when she begs to be taken down and she will confess freely. Then follows a long recital of intercourse with the devil, renouncing God, visiting the Sabbat, creating terrible storms (one or two persons can cause a storm, but it requires three to produce a heavy tempest), killing children and cattle, etc. She implicates four accomplices. No time is lost and they are arrested, three women and one man—Diederich Meyers's Barbara of Kenn, Schussel Greth and Kettern Greth of Kenn and Schröter Bernhardt of Kenn, who had served as piper in the Sabbats. On Wednesday, August 6, 1572, the Amtmann, in the Schloss at Fell, has Bernhardt brought before him, in presence of the Meier and three Schöffen and a notary. He is told the cause of his arrest—that for twenty years or more he has been held as a sorcerer in Kenn and its neighborhood, and has been denounced as such by a person now in prison; that they would willingly have him state, *in der Güte*, if it was so or not and he must not conceal the truth. He denies it and says he would wish to see the person who accused him. Eva is brought in and asserts to his face that he was the piper of the witches and had piped to them on the heath of Hetzerode (one of the places of assemblage). He denies it, is tortured and persists in denial. (Note torture on evidence of a single accomplice witness.—H. C. L.) He is remanded to prison.—Ib., p. 17.

Then Diederich Meyers's Barbara is brought in. Says she is seventy years old; her present husband is Peter Weber. Is told the charge; is earnestly questioned on her salvation whether she is not skilled in sorcery; she should voluntarily confess, so that the Amtmann shall not be forced, since Eva, her accuser, is there, to hand her over to the executioner. Replies in the negative and exclaims, "Eva, Eva, bethink thee of thy soul's salvation. The evil fiend speaks through thee; thou art his mother descended upon earth and she has often complained that thou wouldst come to no good end. Eva, reflect well." As Eva adhered to her statement and Barbara would not confess, the executioner was ordered to torture and, though she was for a considerable time tortured *etwas tapfer*, she persisted in asserting her innocence and said it must have been the Evil One in her shape.—Ib., pp. 14–17.

Then Schussel or Jacob's Greth was brought in (about forty years old) and admonished to tell the truth, but, though Eva was present and asserted she was a sorceress, she would not confess, but charged that Eva had accused her out of hatred and envy because she, at the order of the Amtmann, had as midwife examined and accused her (Eva). Then she was hoisted and told the executioner to let her down and she would tell the truth. Then, after resting a little, she said, "Yes, I am a sorceress." Asked for details she said that some twenty years ago, when she was in trouble over a lawsuit with a certain Bartz von Möringh about an inheritance, the evil fiend had appeared to her in her house in the guise of a young fellow and asked her, "Why are you so troubled? Be of good cheer. If you will follow me I will give you money and goods enough." She consented and he had intercourse with her, but it was like an icicle. He gave her money, but, as she took it, it changed into foul black dung. After this the devil had often come to her. Asked for her associates she enumerates Barbara, Eva, Kettern Greth, also Seuntgen in the hollow at Fell, a woman of Becond who had recently married a man of bad repute, and Schröter Bernhard, was their piper. Asked what evil she had done, she answered she had never originated it, but, when the demon asked her to raise storms, to bewitch children and cattle and destroy harvests and she refused, he threatened to beat her, to twist her neck, so that she was forced to consent, and then with this he did it in her shape as though she had done it. It was thus with the storms of 1567, 1570 and 1572 and with the

bewitching of the children and cattle as Eva had testified.—Ib., pp. 18–19.

The last one, Kettern Greth, about sixty years old, was brought in. She confessed nothing in the examination and was tortured, when she admitted she was a sorceress. Asked from whom she learned it, she said that when the tempest came in 1567, as she was gathering wood in the forest of Kenn, the fiend came to her in the shape of a large black man and told her if she would follow him and do his will he would give her much money, which he showed her, and as a poor, sickly and penniless person she had thenceforth obeyed him.—Ib., p. 20.

Hennen suppresses the rest of her confession out of regard for decency.

August 7, Schröter Bernhard, at 7 A.M., was again tortured, as he would not confess without it. Then in his absence Barbara was again sharply tortured, but confessed nothing, though earnestly warned as to her salvation and that the other three persons had named her. As Schussel Greth had revoked her confession of yesterday, she was brought in and hoisted, when she confirmed it and said that she deserved death for renouncing God and giving herself to the devil and was ready to die. Kettern Greth also revoked, but in the torture confirmed her confession and said Barbara, Schussel Greth and Eva had helped to make the great storm of 1567. Also Hermann Wullenweber, who was one of the Schöffen present, had helped to bewitch a child and had aided Eva in her evil works. Asked how Eva had helped to make the storm at Kirsch, when she was in prison here at Fell, she said that she, Barbara, and Jacob's Greth had come to the castle of Fell, taken her out and returned her when it was done.—Ib., pp. 21–2.

August 13. As Kettern Greth had again revoked her confession, she is again (for the third time) tortured, when she confirms it. Eva had given her some of her ointment, with which she flew through the air; she had also helped to raise storms, to bewitch children and cattle and ruin harvests. Asked whether since she practised sorcery she had confessed and taken the sacrament, she said she had confessed to Bartholomeus, the priest of Longuich; when she took the sacrament she spit it out and trampled on it.—Ib., p. 22.

Then the Amtmann, in presence of the three Schöffen, of the Meier and the notary, caused Barbara to be brought from

prison and confronted with Kettern Greth and Eva—Schussel Greth being sick and out of her mind. Then Greth and Eva told Barbara she was a sorceress and their leader, she had taught the art to Eva. Barbara was warned to tell the truth for her soul's sake and to escape torture. She does not confess and is severely tortured without success, merely saying that, if they accuse her of what she is ignorant, she will crouch (*kriechen*) with them in hell.—Ib., p. 23.

The same is done with Bernhard the piper, but he would confess nothing, and in the torture complained that they would not stake their lives on his understanding sorcery and piping for them.—Ib., p. 23.

"They were returned to prison and the Amtmann ordered me to write out the process."

Then the three who had confessed were summoned to appear before the court on August 19 and to suffer what the law provides for them. In accordance with the Carolina they were condemned to death. The report ends here and what became of Barbara and Bernhard is not known, but it is to be hoped that they escaped with the suffering endured.—Ib., p. 23.

The above trials are interesting as an illustration of the crude procedure of the period in these matters. In spite of all the carefully worked out definitions of the jurists as to the *indicia* justifying torture, we see that it is the immediate recourse of the judges on the evidence of a single accomplice. No defence seems to be allowed. There is no secrecy, for the first step is confrontation and then the appeal to torture is a matter of course. Revocation at once brings a second torture and its repetition a third, when the victim's endurance is exhausted and she does not venture to incur more with the prospect of indefinite repetition.

Two tortures without confession apparently secure immunity—though it is not specified.

I should have premised on the start that Eva was on trial for child-murder, which was proved on her by witnesses. The charge of sorcery on which she was tortured and implicated the other four is not detailed by Hennen, who merely qualifies it as "humbug."

Chapeaville alludes to the witch-persecution at Trier and, after mentioning the case of Dr. Flade,[1] he gives that of

[1] What Chapeaville says as to Flade deserves insertion here. It is the one passage of importance found too late by me for use in my "The Fate of Dietrich Flade."—B.

"Quos [maleficos] inter fuit vir assiduus nec incelebris I. Utriusque Doctor Wlattenus, Archiepiscopi et Electoris Trevirensis Consiliarius, qui post sex mensium custodiam capitalis criminis reus, et ad rogum damnatus, publiceque deductus, eum factorum pœnitens subiit, ac in eo deflagravit, hoc genus facti non damnatæ nec improbatæ, sed liberalis artis esse antea contendebat, eaque res tractata et agitata, in Imperiali auditorio sive camera, ad quam provocaverat, a qua postea ad Iudicem competentem miser et miserabilis remissus."

another man who, in reward for abjuring the faith, had received from the demon the gift of exciting tempests, bewitching the harvests, transferring them from one to another, rendering men impotent and of becoming a werwolf, in which shape he had devoured thirteen men.—Gesta Pontiff. Leodiens., III, p. 557.

THAMM, MELCHIOR.—*Femgericht und Hexenprozesse.* Leipzig, s.d. [1903].

The author prints the protocol of the trial of Susanna, wife of Stein Dietherich, in 1627 at Neuerburg. (This place is now in Rhenish Prussia, but was then in Luxembourg—consequently Catholic.—H. C. L.) It is headed "criminal action between the lord of Neuerburg, ex-officio prosecutor, and Steins Dietherich Hausfrau Susanna of Wassweiler, suspected of the crime of sorcery."

Hearing, August 6, 1627. Before the Schultheiss und Gerichte of Neuerburg appeared the attorney of the "gemeiner Herrn" and represented that Susanna had long been defamed for sorcery in her place of residence and daily became more so, and it was the duty of the authorities to order an inquisition and decree through their constituted attorney to confirm the information, appoint a day and proceed. After hearing the attorney the Schultheiss and Gerichte appointed an attorney to proceed against Susanna and named August 11. —Thamm, pp. 139–40.

At the same time the prosecuting attorney presents the accusation in seventeen articles and asks that she be required to answer them personally without the assistance of a procurator. The articles recite various evil deeds of no great import performed by her and from it it appears that she has been accused by her accomplices, Hosse Grethe and Hansen Mülner, both of whom were executed—the former on September 2, 1627.—Ib., pp. 140–2.

Another, Paulus Cremer, also executed (p. 167), brother of the accused.

August 12, 3 "praetores" (Schöffen?) present. The prosecutor presents two witnesses in support of his articles, both claiming to have been made sick by her and one adding that for fifteen years he had repeatedly called her a sorceress without her replying.—Ib., pp. 142–4.

Same day he presents two more witnesses (same praetores present). One says that twenty-four years before Quirin's

Eva had called her a witch without her replying. The other is Eva, who says that in a quarrel twenty-four years ago she called the prisoner a witch, for which Susanna prosecuted her, but her complaint was dismissed. Witness knows nothing more.—Ib., pp. 144–5.

August 13 (two praetores present). The Schultheiss und Gericht order the information sent to the provincial government at Luxembourg, so that advisers shall be appointed. On August 23 this is endorsed, "Les avocats Zorn et Binsfeld donneront advis."—Ib., pp. 145–6.

October 4 (two praetores present) the prosecutor asks a term for next day to present more evidence.

October 5. Fifth witness is Kreyer Peter, who confirms some of previous evidence. The prosecutor also presents an extract from the process of Hosse Grethe, executed September 2, 1627. This is all sent to Luxembourg and returned with the same endorsement, October 8.—Ib., pp. 146–7.

November 5 (four praetores present). Delay was caused by absence of Schultheiss. Decreed after examining the information and the *advice of the jurists* that the demands of the prosecutor be granted, the accused be arrested and be required on November 9 to answer the accusations without aid of procurator. Two men are sent to Wachsweiler and she is brought to prison in Neuerburg.—Ib., pp. 147–8.

November 9. Preliminary hearing (two praetores present). Prisoner is sixty years and more old, as she says; cannot make the great cross (cross herself?); has no cross to her rosary and not versed in the ten commandments. She is earnestly and Christianly exhorted to bethink herself of her salvation and her conscience, and prevent delay and greater costs. Says she has injured nobody and, without being questioned, that she has not renounced God and the Virgin, but has always prayed the latter to preserve her from evil. Her exculpations are interrupted by the prosecutor presenting the accusation and demanding answer article by article. She answers each article as best she can and is cross-questioned on one. Finally declares herself innocent and says, if she were guilty she would confess it. As all exhortations proved fruitless, she is told that, if she has anything to urge in her defence or desires procurators or advisers, all means of defence are allowed to her. Says she is a poor weak person, she knows of no means of disculpation, but will rely in God and justice and await the end. Then her husband, who had

been summoned for the purpose, was allowed to enter and asked in presence of the court and his wife if he intended to defend her with legal methods. He says that God and she alone knew of these hidden things; that he did not know how to make defence; that it was his desire and duty to defend her in all allowable things, and he urged her, if she knew herself guilty, to bethink herself of her salvation and make free confession, which would be to her salvation and the saving of costs. She persisted in declaring herself innocent. He repeated his warning and left the matter to God and justice. She said that if she were guilty she would confess it. As no warnings were effective, she was remanded to her cell.—Ib., pp. 148–50.

In the afternoon the gaoler who took her food to her reported that she had resolved to discharge her conscience with true confession and asked him to beg the judges to reassemble. She is brought in and confesses that ten or eleven years ago some one appeared to her whom she thought to be the evil spirit; a few days later, in the absence of her husband, he came again in the daytime, but disappeared on her calling upon Jesus; a few days later, when she was alone, he appeared in her chamber by day in man's form, with red striped garments, when she promised to follow him and at his command renounced God and the Virgin. Asked if he imposed a mark on her; says no, but after renouncing God she had pains in the head. Asked how he called himself and her; says he called himself Beelzeboeck and gave her no name. On examination says that soon afterwards her demon lover on a Thursday night carried her through the air to the Sabbat at Flocken Posch, where they danced, not as men do, but "mit der Seit zwerck zusammen." There she saw Plüger's Else, Weyer Hansen's wife Lena, Lenze Peter's wife Treis, all of Wachsweiler, and Hans Hansen's wife Maria. Had also seen at the Sabbat Iskort Adolph's widow Apollonia of Manderscheidt, Hornuss Jakob's widow Greth of the same place, Grüner Wilhelm's mother Lena and Kester Hubrichten's wife Susanna, both of Lobscheidt. (Observe all of these are women and none of them are those who accused her—yes, one; see below. There must have been an epidemic of persecution and possibly she may have purposely included some of those already under trial or executed.—H. C. L.) Asked about the piper, says she did not know him. Asked about consultations (of evil to be done), says there were none.

Asked about other Sabbats. Says that four weeks later on a Thursday evening she mounted a broom and flew through the door to a place near Heidthauser, where she saw four of the above-named. Also the wife of Meyer of Puntesfeldt, since dead, and Hans Mülner, executed (one of her accusers); also Tasser's Paulus of Darkscheidt, who had twice been imprisoned and tortured for sorcery; he was the piper there and had three *stäuber* from each of them as wages. They sat on the ground and drank beer. Knew of no consultations. At nightfall, audience adjourned till next day.—Ib., pp. 151–3.

November 10 (four praetores present). She is brought in again and earnestly urged, for while it appears that she has not yet wholly cleared her conscience, yet she desires to make a full confession. Says she can remember nothing more. For the last ten years she has served God in repentance and has not been to the Sabbat. Reminded of what she said yesterday about telling the truth, says that what she told yesterday was the truth, but beyond it she knew herself innocent. Her confession is read over and she confirms it and repeats that since then she has been repentant and has not been tempted (by Satan). She is asked how that is possible, since she had renounced God and the Virgin and had twice been to the Sabbat. She persists and ascribes it to her repentance. It is pointed out that the two executed witnesses testified to seeing her recently at the Sabbat, and at another place than she had mentioned. Says she has no remembrance of such, and asks whether it could occur without her knowledge. Told that it was impossible she should have nothing more to tell, since the demon gave no rest to those who had given themselves to him; she must search her memory and confess. She protests she knows nothing more. Extract from Hosse Greth's evidence read to her about her dancing at the Sabbat above Puntesfeldt. She denies it. Is told that she can not be believed. Says the executed persons must have seen incorrectly. This fencing continues, including some of the evidence of accusing witnesses, but without breaking down her pertinacity. Earnestly urged to clear her conscience; asked if she wished assistance or procurators; says she leaves it to God and justice.—Ib., pp. 153–6.

Seeing that she is obstinate, the prosecutor appears and demands that she be tortured, as she will not clear her conscience sufficiently. The Schultheiss and Gericht resolve to submit her confession and the demand of the prosecutor to

Luxembourg. The reply, November 12, is "Les avocats Zorn et Binsfeldt donneront advis."—Ib., p. 156.

November 18 (five praetores present). The Schultheiss received the process November 17 and summons the court to assemble at 8 A.M. of the 18th. The process is discussed and the *advis* dated 13th (evidently that of the advocates). In accordance with the latter the prisoner is brought in and asked what more she has remembered to clear her conscience. Has nothing further to add, and repeats this on a second monition. As she persists in rejecting these salutary Christian admonitions, the witnesses, who had been summoned in all haste, are brought in and sworn in her presence, according to the avisation. Then each one is taken apart to be separately confronted with her. The witness is asked if he confirms his testimony. He says yes and is ready to do so in presence of the prisoner. Then his evidence is read to him and he confirms it. The confrontation then takes place; he is asked if he knows her person and name; he says she is Stein's Susanna of Wassweiler. She is asked if she knows him, and says he is her neighbor Peter Theyss. This recognition being made, his deposition is read aloud and he confirms it to her face. She does not admit it; he persists. The same ceremony is followed with the other witnesses, except one, who has not come. His deposition is read to her and she declares that she has done no wrong before God and the world.—Ib., pp. 156–9.

She is urged, in view of this convincing evidence, to tell the truth. She fell from her chair to the floor and injured her eye, which bled, and without answering she went out of the door (I suppose was led out—H. C. L.). Then the missing witness appears and confrontation takes place with the same result.—Ib., p. 159.

Then extracts are read to her from the confessions of the two executed witches who had seen her in Sabbats at Puntesfeldt and Heilhausen. Says she knew there was a place of meeting at Puntesfeldt and had heard there was one at Heilhausen, but had never been there. She was said to have been at the former ten days before her arrest, but she had been sick for a fortnight before the arrest, so how could it be. She denies everything except that ten or eleven years ago she had seen a striped being who disappeared when she invoked Jesus; afterwards she had performed *Bittgänk* and called on God and since then had never been tempted.—Ib., p. 160.

Again earnestly exhorted, she remains persistently negative. Is told that she can bring forward anything in her defence, but says she leaves it to God and justice and renounces all legal help. Her husband presents himself of his own accord and both are invited to defence, but are content to await the result of the law. She is remanded to her cell till the afternoon.—Ib., p. 160.

Afternoon. She is earnestly admonished to unburden her conscience with a full confession. She has nothing further to say, but stands to what she has confessed. Asked if she has associated with the evil one. Says yes. Warned that such doubtful and variable confession cannot suffice; that she must know in her conscience whether she is guilty or not and should make a positive and true confession. Says she has done so and should not be further molested, but admits that at the command of the demon she had renounced God and his Mother, which she did unwillingly and greatly repented. Asked if she had dishonored the Sacrament; denies it but admits that the demon had urged her to do so, without her knowing in what way to do it. Asked if she had been at the Sabbat; says that she had never been at Heilhauser, but admits that she had been at Puntesfeldt about fourteen weeks ago. (This would be August 12. Evidently her first confession was fictitious—she forgets what she had said both then and when the evidence was read; she is getting exhausted and incapable.—H. C. L.) Refuses to answer further questions. Is led to the torture chamber, where the executioner screws up his instruments. At this sight she begs to be released and she will confess all she knows.—Ib., pp. 161–2.

Begins by saying it is fifteen years since she renounced God and gave herself to the devil. As this differs from her first confession she is taken to the *instrumenta* and her hands are tied behind her back, when she cries to be loosened and she will confess clearly (p. 162). After this the confession is in response to a series of questions—not leading ones—and details are superfluous. As to the accomplices, she names the same eight as before and begs to have her hands loosened. Then she adds the hatmaker Stoffel of Wachsweiler; he had been one of the witnesses against her, and she is warned not to accuse him unjustly; she says his evidence was weak and she is not unjust (p. 164). The same warning is given when she names Botten Thomas and Hosse Paulus. Subsequently names Tasch Paulus as having at the Sabbat drawn wine for

the guests from a hollow tree (p. 164). Denies that she used ointment (repeats this subsequently, p. 167) to fly to the Sabbat—the demon came for her and carried her through the air (p. 165). Asked how her husband did not know of it—says that well might be, as her body remained in the house (p. 166). Asked if the demon made a witch-mark on her, says he clutched the front of her head, which hurt her (p. 166). Says that tempests are raised by bell-ringing, which she calls Hundtsbellen (p. 166).

Is warned for her salvation and to escape perdition to make full confession and to accuse no one through hate or envy. The executioner is ordered to tighten the cords. Under this torture and standing with uncertain foot she begs to be untied and will confess better, as the pain interferes with it. Questioned as to the evidence against her, she admits its truth, she appearing at night to the pastor Daniel, whom she says they wished to kill, but were not able. He had done something to her brother, Paulus Cremer, who brought with him for the purpose some black material made out of frogs and dung. Had also done this to the second witness, Peter Theiss, and the first one, Lühr Peter.—Ib., pp. 167–8.

While still bound, her confession is read over to her for confirmation and she is asked whether she has not unjustly denounced Hosse Paulus. She confirms the denunciation and says she has done no injustice to any one, and offers to ratify it with the bitterest death. After this light torture she is unbound, is warmed before a fire and led to her cell.—Ib., p. 168.

November 14 (five praetores present). She is brought out and asked if she ratifies the confession made yesterday under torture and has done no injustice to anyone. She does so, but thinks she was mistaken in naming hat-maker Stoffel as present at the Sabbat. Her confession is read to her with repeated warnings to accuse no one unjustly. She confirms it, but has doubt as to Stoffel; as to the others she is ready to suffer death and offers to confront them. She hopes for eternal life and begs to be helped to it as speedily and with as little cost as possible.—Ib., pp. 168–9.

November 17. The Schultheiss und Gericht sent the papers to Luxembourg. Returned 18th, "les avocats Zorn et Binsfeldt donneront avis."—Ib., p. 169.

November 20 (six praetores present). After the messenger returned with the process, and the advice of the jurists, dated

19th, was read (the jurists evidently were at Luxembourg—the case was referred to them by the court and they guided the proceedings and result—H. C. L.) the prisoner was brought in and asked if she confirmed and stood by her confession and was ready to ratify it with her death. It is read over and she declares that she maintains it and is prepared to suffer bitter death on it. Five of those she accused are summoned to confront her. Three do not obey the summons. Two appear, when she confirms her denunciations and they deny. As she persists in ratifying her confession, the sentence advised (by the jurists) is pronounced. It purports to be between the official prosecutor and the prisoner, and in accordance with the advice and deliberation of the jurists, but is in the name of the "Schultheiss und Gericht der Stadt und Hochgerichts Neuerburg," pronounces her confessed and guilty, and condemns her to be delivered to the executioner to be taken to the usual *Richtplatz*, where as a dreadful example she is, after strangulation, to be burnt to ashes and dust; the costs to be taxed according to law, and a *Herrnstraff* of 14 gold gulden.—Ib., p. 169–71.

This latter fine throws a flood of light on the mania for killing. Observe that there is no confiscation.

This procedure seems to show the inquisition-process in its best form. There is no concealment of witnesses or evidence and opportunity of defence is freely offered—yet it is recognized as useless. Torture vitiates all, especially when the judges are convinced in advance of guilt and resolved on conviction. The reference to headquarters at every stage is no protection to the accused, for everything runs in a customary routine. The woman was evidently innocent, though she may have had occasional visions, and the evidence was of the flimsiest.

If, as Catholic writers boast, Cologne was [relatively] free from witch persecution, its Archbishop Maximilian Heinrich [1643–88] was not so minded. In his Provincial Council of 1662, he copies the bull *Summis desiderantes*, showing that the Mall. Malef. was fully credited:

"Omnibus vero dictis magis execrandi sunt magi atque sagae, qui maleficiis corpora, non praestigiis solum, sed vere miris immutant modis, illecebris et philtris homines ad idololatriam aliaque scelera pelliciunt, suis incantationibus fascinant, dementant et interimunt incautos, bruta animalia necant, morbos, grandines, auras noxias, sterilitatem, daemone ad hoc eis opitulante, inducunt, hominibus, pecoribus et terrae frugibus nocent, in maribus vel foeminis usum matrimonii impediunt, omniaque nocendi genera, non siderum aut maleficiorum vi, sed daemonum pacto et concursu machin-

antur."—Conc. Colon., ann. 1662, P. I, tit. iv, c. 5, §2 (Hartzheim, IX, p. 945).

In all cases where death has followed these practices, the offender, even for a first offence, is to be relaxed to the secular arm. Where notable injury has been effected to man, beast or harvest, but not death, the penalty is imprisonment for life.—Ib., c. 6 (p. 946).

Then the offence is ecclesiastical, but does not require relapse to be capital.

In spite of the approbation of the Mall. Malef. by the Cologne theologians,[1] that city was remarkably merciful. During the sixteenth century the only punishment administered was the pillory and temporary prison. In the seventeenth century things changed for the worse. The archbishop represented that this brought many witches, and from 1627 to 1632 there was a vigorous persecution. The last execution was in 1655. Even during this time the proceedings were not as arbitary and cruel as elsewhere; it required more than three votes to condemn; the property of the condemned was not confiscated, but the costs of the trial were charged to it.—Carl Meyer, Der Aberglaube des Mittelalters u. der nächstfolgenden Jahrhunderte (Basel, 1884), p. 320.

Tuetey, Alexandre.—*La Sorcellerie dans le Pays de Montbéliard au XVII^e Siècle.* Dôle, 1886.

The County of Montbéliard was not a part of Franche-Comté, but a distinct part of the Holy Roman Empire. It suffered terribly in the Thirty Years' War and afterwards during those of Louis XIV. It belonged to the Dukes of Württemberg, to whom it was restored by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Both religions were tolerated, with Protestantism in the ascendant, until Louis XIV in 1681 assumed the sovereignty and made Catholicism dominant, a position which it maintained when in 1696 the Duke of Württemberg was restored to his independent rights. (See Bruzen la Martinière, *Dictionnaire Geog.*, VII, p. 474.)

In 1654 and 1656 we find Duke Leopold Friedrich graciously modifying sentences of witches by ordering decapitation before burning—showing his supreme jurisdiction.—Tuetey, pp. 3, 7.

It does not appear, however, that sentences were submitted to him for ratification. In these cases the convicts petitioned him for the modification. Evidently the sentences were not executed the day they were rendered, so probably they had to be confirmed by the superior jurisdiction.

[1] But see pp. 338 f. above, where Mr. Lea (following Hansen) rejects this "approbation."

The case of Adrienne d'Heur, in 1646, shows that the prosecution was carried on by the procureur général of the Duke before certain magistrates who seem to be known as the Council. That defence was allowed is seen by her being asked if she desired an advocate or procurator, which she declined (p. 62). When the investigation is concluded, the Council reviews the proceedings and decides that she and the papers be transmitted to the mayor, the chief burgomaster and nine sworn burghers for sentence. The procureur does so and asks them for their verdict, which they promise to render according to the written law and imperial constitutions.—Ib., pp. 73–4.

In 1611 a sentence is rendered in Héricourt by the mayor and prévôst assisted by two burghers, at the instance of the official procureur at Héricourt for the Duke.—Ib., p. 10.

There is no trace in any of the cases of referring matters to a superior tribunal or college faculty. Probably the "Council" was the supreme tribunal for the district. In 1563 there is an "Avis du Conseil" that if Carlin Blanchot continues pertinacious he is to be severely tortured (p. 3). So in 1660 the officials of Héricourt apply to the "Conseil de Montbéliard" for its opinion as to examining for the witch-mark. The case results in perpetual exile.—Ib., p. 8.

The witch-mark was regularly sought for. In the case of Claudine Defrance, in 1660, she asks for a second inspection, which is made by the procureur, prévôst and griffier, who are each paid one franc for it.—Ib., p. 14.

The process of pricking is described in the case of Adrienne d'Heur (1646). It is performed by Jacob Hielich, executioner of Montbéliard, and Thiébold de la Cour, executioner of Pourrantruy, who has been called in to assist in torture. They stripped her to the waist and bandaged her eyes and pricked in various places, on the head and back and front, when she complained of pain until the pin was thrust in on the middle of the back below the shoulders, without her feeling it. Then she was pricked on the breasts and arms and thighs, which she felt. The pin had been left sticking in the insensible spot for half a quarter of an hour without her feeling it till the executioner took her left arm and carried her hand to the spot, when she pulled out the pin and no blood followed, though the hole was visible and there was seen around it what looked like the claws of the demon, so it was pronounced the witch-mark in spite of her denials.—Ib., pp. 64–5.

The property of the condemned was confiscated (p. 74) and was sold at auction (p. 7). In 1617 we find a son petitioning for the restitution of the property of his father and another case in which the property is restored to the son on condition of his paying costs (p. 5).

At this period the tract of Goldast shows the question was still unsettled.

The costs of these trials were large. That of Catherine Jeannot (1652) amounted to 480 fr. 3 gros. Those of Pierre Tournier-Faucillier and his wife (1655), 437 fr. 1 gros 1 blanc each, and they were rarely much less than 500 fr. This consisted chiefly in the large fees paid to everybody concerned, from the arrest to the execution, for every act and service performed. The prisoners seem to have been well treated and provided for; in the bills for their maintenance appear wine and pastries and cakes and candles, but this was but a small portion of the whole, amounting in the case of Catherine Jeannot to only 22 frs. at the rate of 6 gros per diem (pp. 12–13). (The gros is $\frac{1}{12}$ fr.—H. C. L.) In the case of Adrienne d'Heur there is a charge of 2 fr. 10 gros for a chemise furnished to her (p. 74).

As we have seen elsewhere, on the occasion of an execution all the officials were feasted. At that of Adriene d'Heur (1646), David Morlot was paid 25 francs for breakfast furnished to the prévôt, the greffier, the mayor, the four sergents and the gaoler. He was also paid 14 fr., 2 batz, for meals furnished to the 4 sergents on the day of her arrest and during the trial. Then, at her execution, September 11, 1646, the expenses were (in addition to the cost of the burning and executioner's fees):

To the ministers (pastors), 2 @ 1 fr. 8 gr. . .	3 fr. 4 gr.
Procureur	1 " 8 "
Mayor	1 " 8 "
Burghers (9) and 4 notables	13 "
Greffier	1 "
2 Taxers and Jacob @ 9 gr.	2 " 3 "
4 Sergents	3 "
François Parau for breakfast and dinner . .	15 " 9 "
	41 " 9 "

(pp. 74–5).

The earliest case recorded is in 1555, that of Richarde Borne, wife of Symonnot Coulerus of Autechaux, who is

claimed by the Archbishop of Besançon as his subject—result not given. She very likely was subject to him, as a large portion of Franche-Comté was mainmortable (p. 3). So in 1572, in the case of Claude Vernier, wife of Pierrot Andry of Grange, the sentence of perpetual exile is rendered by the Officialité of Besançon (p. 4).

In the protracted case of Nicolas Lods, 1652–8, there seem to have been ample facilities allowed for defence, as there is allusion made to memoirs presented by the accused and replies made by the denunciators; also certificates of his upright life and conduct by the pastors of Vyans, Desandans and Trémoins in 1655. Unluckily the result is not stated.—Ib., p. 7.

Apparently the records are very fragmentary and imperfect—too much so to afford grounds for drawing conclusions. In many of the cases only portions of the proceedings are preserved and often the sentences are absent. When they are given they are not always capital—there are several of exile.

Such as they are, what the industry of M. Tuetey has collected are as follows:

1555	1	1616	1	1640	1	1657	1
1563	2	1617	4	1644	2	1658	1
1564	1	1618	4	1645	1	1659	1
1572	2	1619	1	1646	1	1660	3
1583	1	1620	4	1652	3	1661	1
1586	1	1624	1	1654	1	1697	1
1595	1	1627	1	1655	3	1700	1
1611	1	1629	1	1656	4	1713	1

53 (pp. 3–9)

The last three, 1697, 1700 and 1713, seem not to have been pushed beyond preliminaries, but show that witchcraft was still a crime to be legally prosecuted and punished, though the magistrates were averse to executing the laws.

The latest sentence in the records is in 1661, when Jeanne Demoigin was perpetually banished. The latest executions were in 1660, when Jeanne Mairot and Elisabeth Mermet were condemned to death.—Ib., p. 8.

When persecution was so vigorous between 1650 and 1660, it is not likely that the interval between 1661 and 1697 is due to absence of prosecutions—but rather to lack of records.

M. Tuetey in his treatment of the matter seems to accept all the wild stories of the confessions as genuine beliefs on the part of the accused,

arising from delusions. His theory is that there was a wide-spread delirium on the subject and that all those condemned were under the illusion of the reality of their crimes.

KLÉLÉ, J.—*Hexenwahn und Hexenprozesse in der ehemaligen Reichsstadt und Landvogtei Hagenau.* Hagenau i. Els., 1893.

In the little town of Ensisheim the first burning was in 1551 and the next in 1571. From 1571 to 1620 there were 8 men and 80 women burnt.

In Thann, 4 in 1572, and up to 1620 there were 8 men and 142 women.

In the village of Oberbergheim, 44 women between 1583 and 1630.

In Schlettstadt, 4 on October 22, 1570. From 1629 to 1642, 91.—Klélé, p. 15.

In 1571 and 1572 there were burnt in Colmar, 13; Turckheim, 8; Sulzbach, 4; Hattstatt, 6; Herrlisheim, 5; Sigolsheim und Umgegend, 7 (pp. 15–16).

In 1575 at Gebweiler, 6; 1589 at Sulz, 6; at St. Amarin, 8; at Altkirch and Hagenbach, 5; from 1597 to 1615 in Ruffach, 10 (p. 16).

The magistrates of Strassburg were averse to the persecution, yet there were executions there in the seventeenth century.

The records are too fragmentary to form an estimate as to the total number in Alsace. Theiler, who inventoried the episcopal archives of Strassburg, examined 2000 processes. For the bishopric the estimate is that between 1615 and 1635 there were 5000 witches burnt, of whom 800 were from Sundgau and Breisgau (pp. 15–16).

A professional opinion of the early seventeenth century which served as guide for procedure in Alsace warns the courts that the torture of sleeplessness is safest, for inexperienced executioners are apt to break the bones or to prevent confession by too speedy a death. To the question whether false statements are lawful to obtain confession he replies that Bodin says yes, but he draws the distinction that only equivocal and misleading promises are permissible. Formerly all witches were burnt alive, but in our milder time those who repent, abjure consorting with demons and seek with contrite heart to be reconciled to God and the Church should first be strangled or beheaded, according to the custom of the place (pp. 19–20).

To the question as to confiscation, the answer is that all

possessions of the convict are to pass to the public treasury, as witches cause dearness by destroying crops and cattle.

To the question what is to be held as to those who deny the existence of witchcraft, the reply is that they are godless men, teachers of error, heretics and not Christians, as they hold, like the atheists, the heathen and the Turks, who believe that there is no devil and no hell and therefore no sorcerers. Such unbelievers incur suspicion that they have the same disease as the witches and only defend them so that they may not be seized in a wolf-skin and be burnt as they deserve (p. 20).

Shall a judge condemn to death one whom he knows certainly to be innocent? Yes, if the case has been juridically tried on the evidence. He cannot set his individual opinion against the regular order of justice (p. 19).

The trials were conducted by the local authorities in each place, who were for the most part unlearned in the law and required advice and instruction. This perhaps accounts for the difficulty of compiling statistics, as the records of the little towns and villages were not likely to be preserved. Also for the fact of our hearing, as above, of so many burnings in this place or in that.

The formula for an interrogatory (pp. 21–2) assumes the guilt of the accused and is directed solely to obtain knowledge of details on which to condemn.

In Hagenau (Alsace) the matter was in the hands of a Hexenausschuss or Witch-commission consisting of some members of the local authorities. When an accused was arrested, the first thing done was to take her to the torture chamber, exhibit the implements of torture and explain to her the operation of each. Thus duly impressed, she was left for some days or weeks to reflect upon the situation. After the earlier period there was no examination of witnesses, other than to confront her with those who had accused her as accomplices (apparently no search for a *corpus delicti* —H. C. L.). This, with the interrogatory, often brought a free confession, without torture, as it was the only way to escape torture and to obtain the grace of strangulation or beheading before burning (pp. 24–5).

As witchcraft was a privileged or excepted case, there was no limit to the torture that could be employed.

After 1620 the confessor who accompanied the convict to the stake was usually a Capucin (p. 29).

The first case of witch-trial in Hagenau occurs in 1531,

when Appolonia von Kaltenhausen, wife of Claus Weber, was arrested and tortured. She declared herself pregnant and the torture was suspended. Then, in consideration of her condition and at the prayer of her husband and two brothers, she was released after taking the *Urphede* not to revenge herself (p. 33).

The records may be imperfect, but there is on record no other case until 1573, when two women were accused of witchcraft. The magistrates then were Protestant. Witnesses were heard; torture seems not to be used and they were discharged (pp. 34–7).

In 1577 Hagenau seems to be Catholic. One of those [accused four years before] is again prosecuted in 1577. The trial lasted nearly a year, during which she was tortured seven times, until finally she no longer revoked and was burnt, August 9, 1578, together with a woman accomplice. Six others were compromised in the course of the trial, but the records concerning them are lacking (pp. 34–47).

This poor creature, known as "die Küberlin," was a midwife. Some of the evidence suggests how dangerous a calling it was, for, besides the belief that midwives were ordered by the demon to destroy new-born infants, when anything went wrong in the parturition it was at once ascribed to their sorcery. For this see Malleus Maleficarum, P. II, q. 1, c. 13.

The next case is in 1580, of Magdalena Ferberin. The records are imperfect, but the woman probably was acquitted. The evidence was trivial (pp. 48–50).

This case and the following one suggest that when the accused was not condemned, but humanely banished, it only postponed the end. The evil suspicion followed her and wherever she settled she was soon on trial again. The Ferberin was tried in Worms in 1571 and exiled. She went to Weissenburg and took service; after a while her employer heard of her past and went to Worms to find out, resulting in her discharge. Then she came to Hagenau with the above result. If acquitted there, it is not likely that she died in peace.

The last case in the sixteenth century was "Anna die Schmidtin" in 1593. She had fled from Masmünster to escape prosecution. In Hagenau she was soon arrested; she was exhorted *in conspectu tormentorum* without eliciting a confession and was ordered to depart with her child (pp. 50–1).

The Council of Hagenau, February 19, 1601, writes to that of Colmar that it has had in prison for some years a woman accused of witchcraft and has not been able to extract a confession from her by torture. Such persons have a pact with

Satan which not every torturer is able to overcome. It understands that the executioner of Colmar has a process to bring out the truth from such persons and it asks that he be sent for the purpose. He will be properly paid and his expenses will be made good (p. 51).

The next case, 1607, is Margreth, wife of Christoph Näher. Her husband endeavored in vain to procure her release. She was severely tortured with thumbscrews and in the strappado until dislocated, without confession, whereupon she and her husband were outlawed and required to leave Hagenau in two days (p. 52).

Three women sent for trial from Surburg by the Landvogt in 1612. They are discharged (p. 53).

Case in 1615 involving 11 persons—eight women, 1 man and two boys. Four women burnt March 20, 1616, and one committed suicide in prison. One of the boys was confined in a hospital; the other was discharged with orders to keep through life 10 miles away from Hagenau. Two of the rest were acquitted. The other two, Georg Ammann and his wife, were sentenced, March 28, he to exile and she, with two other women who had been drawn into the affair, to exile after a scourging (pp. 55–9).

November 26, 1616, one woman strangled and burnt; December 3, another, and December 6 another discharged after two tortures (pp. 61–3). In 1617–18, one tortured and discharged; three tortured and executed. There were nine in all. Two were discharged; three, result unknown but probably executed (pp. 63–70). One woman strangled herself in prison in 1619 (p. 71). In 1619–21, two discharged (p. 71); one executed; three discharged (two of them to be confined in their houses)—all pay expenses (pp. 73–4); one executed; two discharged (p. 75).

The breaking out of the Thirty Years' War and the occupation of Hagenau by Mansfeld, December 30, 1621, with the misery that followed, put an end for some years to witch trials. The failure of the harvests from 1626 to 1628 aroused again the fear of demonic influence and they began anew (pp. 76–7).

July 17, 1627, four women executed, three strangled and burnt, the fourth, as she was only fourteen years old, was beheaded,[1] which seems to have been regarded as more merciful. The details of their trials show how unmercifully tor-

[1] See below, p. 1214.

ture was used to gratify the curiosity of the judges after quite sufficient details had been extorted. It is observable that here, as in the other cases, while ample misdeeds are confessed, to harvests, beasts, children and men, there is no record of any attempt to verify them and ascertain whether there was really any *corpus delicti.* It is also noteworthy that for the first time in these trials there is an allusion to the devil's mark. Marie the Treubelwirthin in her confession (p. 81) says the devil marked her on the left shoulder; the executioner reported a blue spot there, in which he stuck a pin to the head without her feeling it. Such marks are also confessed by two others and frequently afterwards (pp. 77–86).

Of course these victims inculpated others, leading to a wide persecution, as each one was forced to denounce all whom he or she met in the Sabbat or knew to be witches. In this two young rascals of thirteen and fourteen distinguished themselves by confessing the wildest things they could imagine about themselves and inculpating whomever they chanced to think of in successive audiences. Torture was unsparingly used and never failed to bring confession, however brave the victim might be at first. Under its pressure mothers denounced their daughters and daughters their mothers, brothers and sisters did the same, and in the general terror there was nothing too wild and impossible for them to invent to satisfy their torturers. As the result of this, on September 25, 1627, six women, a man and a boy were strangled and burnt, three of the women being first torn with red-hot pincers. Then on October 8 there were three more.—Ib., pp. 87–111.

Three more on November 13, two men and one woman, strangled or beheaded before burning (pp. 113–18); two more on December 14, both women, strangled before burning (pp. 118–20); January 29, 1628, two more women of the same set of processes, strangled before burning; they had inculpated many others, some of them of good social position (pp. 120–7); March 19, two more women, beheaded and burnt (pp. 127–32); between December and February three of the prisoners, one man and two women, committed suicide (pp. 132–6).

The case of "Anna die Schrödlerin" (sixty-five years old) is significant. As early as September 22, 1627, she was named as present at the Sabbat by one of the foregoing. She was a woman of some means and was not at once arrested, but was

imprisoned in her house, with a guard at her expense. Becoming tired of this, she appealed, October 29, to the council either to remove the guard or to arrest her. On this the council condemned her to pay 300 pounds of pfennings (2800 marks) and to be in arrest until paid. Whether she paid this or not is uncertain, but she was arrested December 1. By this time four of the prisoners had accused her and maintained it on confrontation. She stoutly denied and maintained her innocence in two very severe tortures, December 7 and 9, in which both the strappado with weights and the boot were employed. The puzzled judges obtained opinions from two lawyers, who both pronounced that she had purged the evidence and should be discharged, especially as two of her accusers on the way to execution had revoked their confessions. Her family earnestly interceded for her. Still confrontations went on, in which she asserted her innocence unflinchingly and it looked as though she would shortly be discharged when there came a new accusation by her niece Agnesel that she had, after taking communion in the Augustinian church, put the Host in her pocket and there hidden it. The process was then recommenced and as the accusers had only vague statements to make there was no recourse but in torture. Her steadfastness, however, led to the conviction that she was possessed by the demon. On March 14, 1628, she was taken to the torture chamber, shaved and exorcised by the Capuchins. Still she denied, and persisted through four hoistings in the strappado with three weights attached. Legal advice was sought and on March 21 Dr. Laurentius Boos (one of the previous advisers) repeated his former opinion. She had purged the new evidence and should be released, but, as the evidence was strong, she should be banished for 3 or 4 miles from the town and pay all costs. The latter were heavy; her family exerted themselves to raise the amount and it took time. The last we hear of the case, in June, she was still in prison.—Ib., pp. 136–42.

On March 22 and 31, 1628, two of the accused women were discharged after a single torture in which they were held to have purged the evidence (pp. 143–4).

Peter Roller, a boy of thirteen, who had been the chief agent in all this affair by accusing every one whom he could think of as being present in the Sabbat and inventing stories with wonderful ingenuity, had been kept in the hospital. On being examined March 23, he said that the devil had appeared

to him outside the window, when he had driven him away by using the name of Jesus and declared that he would have nothing more to do with him. This was regarded as manifesting improvement. Two friars were assigned for his instruction, to report in fourteen days. On May 17 the report was favorable, recommending his release, which followed in due time and he was delivered to his parents in June (pp. 144–5).

In all, this affair led to 24 executions, 3 suicides and 3 discharges of those who had overcome the torture—broken in body and fortune (p. 146).

The affair seems to have commenced with Marie Niethin, a hysteric girl of fourteen, who admitted her guilt and accused her mistress of misleading her. She was one of those executed July 17, 1627. How she came to be on trial is not stated, but from this it spread, and Peter Roller, who was brought in as accomplice, exercised his imagination and was one of the leading causes of the development.

The credulity of the period is manifested in the report, May 28, 1628, to the Council by one of its members, Jacob Rapp, that the day before, his son, a boy of twelve, in company with another boy, was birdnesting when they met a black dog running along the road until it came to a cottage, when it sat on a stone and was changed into a woman. The boy was duly examined and said he recognized in the woman Margaretha, the young daughter of the burgher Mathis Claus. The magistrates then ordered an investigation as to the girl. The father, frightened at the result of such a proceeding on the reputation of his daughter, presented on June 7 certificates of her good character, but the boys held to their assertion and, on June 14, a resolution was passed to make a more searching investigation—with what result does not appear (p. 146).

A pestilence during the summer of 1628 was naturally attributed to the demon and sharpened the zeal for the extermination of the remainder of those implicated by the preceding victims. The Marschalkrath on September 22 adopted a motion urging this, and speaking of the incessant complaints that reached them that witchcraft was so common that one could point out with his finger those concerned in it (p. 147).

Sybilla Wagnerin, one of the implicated, was soon arrested; she was obstinate, but by December torture had broken down her powers of resistance; she confessed and implicated two men and two women. Of these a married couple, Adam

and Catharina Schlid, attempted flight, but were caught and imprisoned December 20. A new series of prosecutions was thus on foot (pp. 147–8).

It was resolved that the proceedings should be more expeditious.

At the first torture Catharine Schlid and Sybilla were steadfast, but Adam Schlid confessed and implicated his son; a few days later he was found dead in his cell; his body stripped to the waist was dragged through the streets and burnt, December 30. A second and sharper torture was ordered for the women and the younger Schlid. This resulted in further inculpation of the other man and woman alluded to above, and of an additional woman known as the Engelharderin, whose arrest was ordered January 4, 1629, and promptly effected. One of the women, known as the Lebherzin, died suddenly January 8, on being informed of her approaching torture—either through fear or poison which she had provided. As she had not confessed she was ordered to be buried if no mark could be found on her body (pp. 149–50).

A great fear fell on the population. The summary proceedings showed that the wildest accusation could lead to torture and burning and no one knew where the next bolt might fall. People began to murmur and on this same day, January 8, the Council threatened corporal or death penalty for all such talk and that indiscreet persons should be shut up in the madhouse. They emphasized this by ordering the arrest of three more women (pp. 150–1).

Torture brought full confession of long catalogues of misdeeds from the Schlid woman and her son, Sybilla and the remaining man of the first lot. All four were strangled and burnt on January 13 (pp. 151–4).

These persons must have had property, for there arose a quarrel between the city and the Reichsschultheiss in the name of the Empire over the confiscations. It continued for a year or more and there is no evidence as to its settlement. The city appealed to the Oberlandvogt, the Archduke Leopold, proposing that the first charge should be the expenses of prosecution and execution, the balance to be divided into thirds, one each to the Oberlandvogt, the Reichsschultheiss and the Witch-commission, and it plaintively remarked that if the costs could not be met many guilty ones would escape punishment and the honor of the Almighty would not be defended (pp. 155–6).

Meanwhile the prosecution of the four women arrested

early in January was urged forward; from their statements five others were arrested January 16. One of the former and three of the latter were discharged February 7, having confessed nothing. Of the remainder two were sentenced January 20, being allowed, on account of their repentance, to elect between the halter and the sword, when they chose the latter. Another failed in an attempt at suicide February 12, and was hanged February 17. The remaining two were beheaded March 17 (pp. 156–7).

The Schultheiss of Gunstett reported in March that there were there 50 to 60 female and 10 male sorcerers. An investigation was made resulting in the arrest, in September, of Margaretha Strentzin, who was condemned October 6 to be twice torn with red-hot pincers and strangled and burnt. At the remonstrance of her Capuchin confessor, however, she was torn but once before her execution (pp. 154–60).

The return of the scene of war distracted attention from witchcraft, and we hear little more of it. In 1630 an old woman was tortured unsuccessfully on such an accusation and discharged. An old cowherd named Schneider was discharged and replaced by a man named Ackermann. Meeting him in the street Schneider offered him his hand, saying he wished him luck and ill-luck. Soon afterwards Ackermann fell sick and died. The doctors said it was witchcraft and Schneider was prosecuted. He endured torture without confessing, and, as no other evidence could be found, he was sentenced, January 15, 1631, to exile and payment of costs, in spite of a suggestion that he had a *pactum taciturnitatis* (pp. 165–6).

In January, 1631, Jacob Schmidt was sent to Hagenau; he had already been repeatedly tortured with the utmost severity and he again defied the skill of the Hagenau torturer and was perforce discharged. The same occurred with two others, a woman and a man, who were discharged May 7, 1631 (pp. 167–8).

The indescribable sufferings of the war put an end to prosecutions for witchcraft and until the French Protectorate (January 28, 1634) there are no traces of them. Then, in the absence of the Reichsschultheiss, who left as the French entered, the magistrates deemed themselves incompetent for criminal jurisdiction (pp. 169–70).

In November, 1641, the French governor, de Rasilly, asked the magistrates to take action in the case of Marie Frickin,

maid of Frau Nodlerin, who was suckling an infant and accused her maid of injuring her breasts. The magistrates had the breasts examined by two midwives, who pronounced the trouble to be natural (p. 171).

All this Klélé attributes to increasing enlightenment diffused by the Jesuit College established in Hagenau, and to the influence of Spee's Cautio Criminalis, the lack of jurisdiction being merely a pretence (p. 172).

For proof of this he cites the last case of witchcraft, in 1645. Governor de Rasilly designated as a witch a poor old woman known as the Wullenweberin. She was arrested, but the magistrate showed himself disinclined to proceed by torture. The governor's wife, who wished to amuse herself with a witch process, on March 20 sent to inquire whether she was not to be tried. A deputation was sent to the French agent to say she would be examined that day, when he expressed his desire and that of the governor that it should be by torture. The magistrate then asked for torturers, but the council was not inclined to furnish them, when the governor ordered that she should be tried by the water ordeal, a method then used in France but unknown in Germany(!). This would apparently have been done, had not a Jesuit from the pulpit and in public expressed himself energetically against it—it was not lawful for a Catholic judge to decide as to guilt or innocence by such means. The result of this was the discharge of the woman—but a more important result was that from this time there was no one tried for witchcraft in Hagenau (pp. 173–5).

The Netherlands

It would seem that up to c. 1520 witchcraft had made little impression in the Netherlands, if we may judge from the Confessionale of Gottschalk Rosemond, theological professor in Louvain, of which the second edition was published in Antwerp in 1519 (another, Louvain, 1554). It is much larger than those compends usually were and more complete, but the only allusion to sorcery in it that I can find is that in the enumeration of episcopal reserved cases is included the abuse of sacramentals for *maleficia* (fol. 249). The section on lust, for instance, is exceedingly full and detailed, but there is in it no allusion to relations with incubi and succubi, although carnal irregularities are scrupulously treated *seriatim;* nor is there anything about amatory sorcery, though

the methods of seduction by either sex are conscientiously defined. So, under impediments of matrimony nothing is said as to ligatures (fol. 41). This reticence can scarce be otherwise explained, as the author is as free-spoken in general as all such writers. See Godescalcus Rosemondus, Confessionale, Antverpiae, 1519.

The Council of Malines of 1570 makes no reference to sorcery or witchcraft.—Van de Velde and de Ram, Collectio Synodorum Archiep. Mechliniensis, Mechliniae, 1828–9, I, pp. 89–135.

The Malines Council of 1574 likewise contains no reference to these subjects.—Ib., pp. 178–228.

Council of Malines, 1607. All ecclesiastical judges ordered to banish diviners and to punish severely those who consult them—and much more severely "maleficos et incantatores et etiam omnes qui vulgo Aegyptii vocantur" (Tit. xv, c. 2).—Ib., pp. 334, 388; Harduin, Concilia, X, p. 1954.

The Vicar General of Malines, de Coriache, issued a special decree in 1712 on the abuses of exorcism. The towns and the country are filled with imaginary demoniacs and bewitched, through which their neighbors are unjustly suspected and defamed, giving rise to quarrels and fights convulsing whole parishes. For filthy gain exorcists assert the possessed to be bewitched. Through Christ the power of the serpent has been broken and the number of the possessed and the bewitched is much less than of old or than the people believe. Exorcists should beware of attributing to such causes diseases of men and cattle and damage to harvests. They should not allow themselves to be deceived by abandoned women who pretend to be possessed in order to excite charity. They should consult discreet physicians and theologians, so as to ascertain whether there is really demoniac possession, and not, as some do, ridicule all cases as mere delirium.—Van de Velde and de Ram, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 457–62.

Cannaert, J. B.—*Olim. Procès des Sorcières en Belgique sous Philippe II et le Gouvernement des Archiducs.* Gand, 1847.

Letters-patent of the government, July 20, 1590, describe witchcraft as the scourge and destruction of the human race. No new laws or punishments are needed for its repression, but bishops and secular judges are earnestly enjoined to seek out witches and punish them exemplarily.—Cannaert, pp. 3, 5.

This is followed by a royal order, November 8, 1592, speaking of the increase of the crime; although great numbers of women have been burnt there is still a great multitude. They have been convicted by the water ordeal and in this way, in some villages, fourteen or fifteen women have been executed. This is in nowise admissible; the trials must be according to law so that the guilty may be punished and wrong not be done to delirious persons, infatuated with ignorance and old age, as often happens to decrepit old women who are said to be the most addicted to the crime (p. 7).

A rescript of the Archdukes Albert and Isabella, April 10, 1606, speaks of the increase of the detestable crime of witchcraft and sends the letters of July 20, 1592, again to the courts with orders for its immediate execution and full reports as to what is done. At the same time, to put an end to the irregular proceedings of the authorities of the small towns and villages, the courts are ordered to appoint for each district a special judge who shall have cognizance of all cases and report to the court for its action (pp. 87–9).

Under this the superior courts appointed six consulting advocates and Maître Jean de Bloys as special commissioner (p. 11).

These wise provisions did not diminish the number of prosecutions. They increased and an *Ordonnance* of July 31, 1660, renewed that of 1606 and doubled the number of special judges (pp. 11–12).

In this *Ordonnance* the Council of Flanders introduced various regulations to repress abuses—among others, prohibiting executioners from searching for the *stigma diabolicum* and restricting this to physicians, the most distinguished of whom were to be called in for the purpose (p. 14).

This, however, was disobeyed. In 1681 at Mons we find the executioner employed to find the mark (p. 20).

The executioner of Ypres boasted that he had examined women for the witchmark by the thousand and burnt them by the hundred (p. 22).

In a case in Holland, in 1593, where the water ordeal had been used, the court called upon the Leyden faculties of philosophy and medicine for an opinion as to its validity. Their report, March 9, 1594, denied that it had any weight and explained the causes which sometimes induced flotation (pp. 30–2).

Akin to this was the trial by balance, based on the belief

that witches lost weight. This was practised at Oudewater, where people suspected would present themselves to the authorities to be weighed and, after due precautions to see that they did not carry concealed weights, the city weigher would weigh them in the official scales and if the weight corresponded with their size and appearance a certificate to that effect would be given, which would protect them from such accusations. The fees for the process and certificate amounted to a little over 6 florins (pp. 33–8).

See *Superstition and Force*, p. 335, for more of this.

Elizabeth Vlamyncx burnt alive, December 23, 1595, at Ghent (p. 45). Cornélie van Beverwyck burnt alive at Ghent, July 14, 1598 (p. 46). Claire Goessen condemned at Antwerp, August 22, 1603 (p. 48). Digna Robert and Gertrude Willems condemned at Veere, 1565 (pp. 51–5). Martha van Wetteren condemned at Sinay, July 24, 1684, but as she was pregnant she was not burnt until October 23 (p. 55). Elisabeth de Grutere burnt at Ghent, August 9, 1604 (p. 57). See her confession, pp. 119–25.

Josine Labynes strangled and burnt at Heestert, August 1, 1664. This sentence embodies the prices offered by Satan for various misdeeds—for bewitching a man, 10 sols parisis, for a woman 5, for a child 3, for a cow 6, for a horse 14 (pp. 60–5). Mathieu Stoop strangled and burnt at Singhem, September 11, 1657 (pp. 66–8). Jan Van Steen strangled and burnt at Ruppelmonde, January 19, 1637 (pp. 69–73). Jan Vindevogel strangled and burnt at Oycke, July 30, 1661. Besides a long list of murders, he was a *loup-garou* (pp. 73–6).

The sentences of these poor folk convey many details as to the seductions of the demon and misdeeds of the witches.

Certificate by F. Raeymakers, a physician, August 31, 1754, at Ham, that François van Bevere and his wife Jeanne Marie de Pauw are afflicted with atrocious suffering caused by a supernatural malady, incurable by all the resources of science because it is caused by the bewitchment of the parties, and consequently they are remitted to the Church for relief by prayers and exorcisms.—Cannaert, pp. 118–9.

Executions were always accompanied with a banquet partaken by the officials. In some places this preceded the execution and the patient partook of it—with such appetite as he could command. An edict of Charles V in 1546 prescribed the amount that could be spent (p. 126).

As late as 1816 Pierre Bruyland of Onkerseele was executed and his wife was sentenced to imprisonment for having tortured by fire the wife of Jean d'Haene so that she died eight days afterwards. Bruyland's daughter Berlinde suffered from a rheumatic affection which he attributed to witchcraft by the woman and he took this means of forcing her to undo the spell (pp. 127–37).

CHAPEAVILLE, J.—*Gesta Pontificum Leodiensium*. Leodii, 1616.

A thief was received into the poor-house at Liége in 1496. He had a tin image which he twisted with his fingers like soft wax. A woman, seeing this, denounced him. A torturer was brought from Maestricht, who recognized him as his brother and said he would make him sing in revenge for ill turns done to him. He replied, "I will not sing for you, for I will confess without torture. Both I and my wife, who visited me in prison two days ago, are sorcerers. We killed our young son at the urge of the devil to perform *maleficia*." Asked how his wife could enter the closed prison, he said she could go anywhere; "for, some years since, she brought me twice to this city to burn it, but there were so many churches that we could do nothing." He refused to repent and was broken on the wheel.—Chapeaville., III, pp. 230–1.

The following case, in 1595, which Chapeaville describes at first hand and at great length, is of much interest. It indicates great caution and patience in the ecclesiastical prosecutors and is a very curious instance of persistent belief on the part of a repentant sorcerer in the truth of his acts, unless, indeed, he was afraid of retraction, as impenitence leading to burning. [The translation is slightly abridged].

"The accused, Jean del Vaux, was priest and monk in the renowned abbey of Stablo. On suspicion of sorcery and other crimes, the prior imprisoned him. On hearing this, the abbot sent me there and, on examining him, he said he was tired of the tyranny of the devil and with tears voluntarily related his life to me and the prior. When tending his father's cattle he had committed many crimes, and in his fifteenth year he met in a wood an old man in a religious habit, who asked if he would serve him and promised great honors in any career that he might choose. He rashly assented and the man appeared again in a monstrous form and made two marks on his shoulders, which we saw, carried him to the Sabbat in various places, gave him poison with which to kill

men and the cattle of his parents and others, accompanied him to the schools in Trier, advised him to assume the religious habit, which he did, reaching the priesthood. With poison furnished by the demon he killed the prior and other religious in hope of attaining the priorship. He had many accomplices in his sorceries.

When I reported this to the abbot, he ordered a judicial investigation and sent me with Andreas Stegnart, his suffragan, and a notary to Stablo. In the examination we found him imbued by the demon with many pagan and heretic errors and we instructed him in the faith. The abbot wished an exact examination, so that if, led by repentance, he should persist in his accusations (for he had accused over 500 accomplices) greater reliance could be given to these accusations."—Ib., pp. 593–4.

"December 28, the abbot sent a commission to Stablo about the confession and accusations, which involved men of all ranks and conditions, granting full powers to Andreas Stegnart and to me as his vicar-general, to the renowned Pieter Oran, his chancellor and scabinus of Liége, and to Jean Molempeter as advocate fiscal, to have cognizance of the affair, to judge and execute, and to adjoin experts. Early in January, 1596, we went to Stablo; on the way the carriage in which we journeyed was broken in two by the demon and we finished the journey on the horses of our servants, no one being hurt. We would not have known this to be a snare of the demon, were it not that, when in the evening we entered the prison, Jean del Vaux made an excuse for the breaking of the carriage, saying it was not his demon, who had never hurt him, but another ill-conditioned one. The next morning he was examined on the articles drawn up by the fiscal and was warned not rashly to accuse anyone, when he not only confirmed his confession but named his accomplices, designating the company of sorcerers to which each belonged, to what places he had been carried by his demon, what had been done in the assemblies, what honors had been paid to the presiding demon, how the insane banquets were arranged, what diabolical mixtures and incantations wrought ill to the human race, cattle and harvests. Interrogated about them, he stated that there were nine societies—of Stablo, Houfalis, Trier, Tafgnies, Cheren, Malmedy, Salm and Vaux. Asked where each held its assembly, he said that of Stablo met at Stablo near the gate of the abbey, in the fields near St. Vitus, in the

district of Bossut and at Croy on the Mosel; and he did the same with all the others. Moreover, he gave name and surname of nearly 200 persons, designating the society and class to which each belonged. Then on certain days' examinations he was asked how the assemblies were held and he said that Beelzebub, demon of the first class, was adored, his footprints were kissed; then the tables were spread, presided over by the demon, where every one sat according to his class. At the first table sat with their wives those called *Les Braffz hommes*, eating and drinking what was brought by the members or stolen. In place of a blessing the feast commenced with "En nom de Beelzebub, nostre grand maistre, souverain Commandeur et Seigneur, noz, viandes boire et manger soyent garnis et munis pour noz refections, plaisirs et voluptez," when all responded "Ainsi soit-il." At the end, "De nostre refection salutaire prinse et receue nostre Commandeur, Seigneur et maistre Beelzebub soit loué, gracié et remercié à son exaltation et commun bien," to which the response was "Ainsi soit-il." When the tables were removed, dancing began, when among other nastiness the *pudibunda* of the demon were kissed. There were songs, usually commencing with "Abois burnette ratendez nous," and promiscuous intercourse followed with demons in the shape of men and women, and there was a common harlot sorceress named *Bonne lance*. At the time of departure, about the first cock-crow or ringing of the bells, the demon distributed poisons for them to use in their sorceries. He said there were several tables, at which each sat according to his class; he held the first place in the fourth class. Asked who sat at each table, he named twelve men of the first class with their wives, called *les braffs hommes*, presided [over] by Beelzebub with two assessors, Leviatan and Astaroth (Astaroth was Venus and his succuba). Then he mentioned who sat at each table. To test his accuracy after some days we adjured him to bear in mind his salvation and to bring no false accusations and read to him the names, mixing them up as to the tables, when he would correct us and repeat his first statements literally. This went on for many days, he accusing many ecclesiastics and laymen; he said he had often been with the company of Trier, where the first place was held by Dr. Vlatte (Flade), the councillor of the Elector, who was burnt. Then, sitting as a tribunal, we gave him repeated audiences, treating him kindly and investigating in every way his life and actions; but we found

him invariably the same, so as to remove all suspicion of his not being in his right mind. Also, Oran and I repeatedly visited him in his cell and examined him in every way, and he constantly affirmed that his confession was not imaginary or through diabolical illusions, as we said it seemed to us, but that it was really and personally so, and he gave many *indicia* by which he knew whether he was really at the demonic assemblies or only in imagination. This was reported to the abbot, who considered the matter carefully and ordered us to institute judicial proceedings against the accused, both ecclesiastics and laymen, which was done sedulously throughout the year until January 10, 1597, when the arrest was ordered, not only of old women and common men, but of the first people of the place, the praetor himself, named Kaimerlinck, some scabini and parish priests and religious of advanced age, learning and judgment."—Ib., pp. 595–8.

"On January 10, after giving him an advocate and syndic, the articles of the fiscal were read to Jean del Vaux, with the answers already given by him, which he confirmed and said that, without risking his salvation, he could not revoke anything he had asserted against himself or others. The fiscal asked for sentence; nine terms were given him and he was earnestly warned of the perilous state in which he had lived under the devil's tyranny and should seriously beware of losing all hope of salvation by false confessions and accusations. He repeated that he could alter nothing without falsehood and perjury and only hoped for a merciful sentence and reconciliation to God. Unsatisfied with this, the syndic asked that the monks of Stablo still sick with the *maleficium* should be heard, when the Prior Gilles de Harset, Maurice of Offia (?), Quirinus de Generet, Corbiel Neussonge and Pascal of Limburg, all testified that they believed themselves bewitched by *maleficia* placed in various parts of the abbey by Jean del Vaux or other sorcerers. Finally the syndic demanded that Jean should be tortured so that his evidence could be better used against his accomplices, the accused being present and only imploring the mercy of God. Then after the customary monitions the decree was issued." Its form is given, as rendered by Chapeaville as commissioner, ending—"dicimus et declaramus, praeallegatum D. Joannem reum accusatum (antequam ad plenam definitionem procedatur) quaestionibus esse subjiciendum et per torturam pro ulteriori inquisitione examinari debere, datum 19 Martii, 1597."

"When this was promulgated, the minds of many of those suspected of sorcery being exacerbated, the rumor was spread that we were dealing with an insane man. To meet this false rumor we ordered a number of prelates, nobles, honorable men, officials, etc. (among whom were some suspects of sorcery), to be assembled and in their presence Jean del Vaux was repeatedly examined as to his confessions and accusations, when he so bravely, firmly and appositely answered to all and to the oppositions warmly urged by the suspects, that he dispelled the opinion of being of unsound mind.

Not content with this, those conscious of evil spread letters written by him during captivity to the captains de la Bourlotte and Gobreville and to Sieur de Wils which seemed to contain evidence of insanity, as he promised by his art to kill all the enemies of the Catholic King. Examined as to these, he said that he feigned insanity in hopes of liberation. Then everything from the beginning was repeated in the vernacular for the benefit of those ignorant of Latin, when he repeated several times that everything in his confessions was true.

Then he was confronted with Jean de Frouville, pastor of Stablo, accused of sorcery. When Oran, most experienced in judicial affairs, wondered at Frouville's categorical denials, Jean del Vaux satisfied his wonder by pointing out the solemn oath taken in the societies to maintain secrecy, renewed every year, as was done not long before in the society of Stablo, when he was present, and recognized de Frouville.

Then the syndic asked that everything be read over to the accused and he be asked, in the name of God and under pain of eternal damnation, if he adhered to his confession; to which he replied that his confessions were true and he could not and would not recede from them. Unsatisfied with this, the syndic demanded the torture, not only as in attestation but to add to its strength in the best way, *so that those guilty of crime should have no cause of complaint.* Torture was then applied, in which, when the articles of the fiscal were repeated, he testified, under his salvation and pain of damnation, that each and all of those named by him were and had been accomplices of sorcerers, that he had seen them in the societies and with them had done what he had declared. Again seriously admonished to think over his confession lest he should accuse wrongly, prayers and exorcisms were employed, and he firmly repeated that all that he had said was true, and he called God to witness to whom he looked for pardon for his almost

hopeless soul. Then the improbability was further pointed out to him of the number of accomplices and associates, but he adhered firmly to his statements. Finally all joined in prayer with exorcisms that he should say nothing contrary to truth, when he declared that he would adhere to the accusations to the end of his life. The dangers of perjury and false witness were represented to him, but he adhered to his statements. At length removed from the torture, he was carried to the hearth, with sound limbs, for the torture was light. His shoulders being bare, we saw the witch-marks and we learned their truth by deeply thrusting needles in them, he feeling nothing and not knowing what we did.

The fiscal then asked and received a copy of all the proceedings, alleging that they would serve not only against the accused but also as evidence against whomsoever it be, and as a basis for a general inquisition.

He also asked the accused to be cited to appear at 7 o'clock, April 2, before Chapeaville, commissioner and judge, to hear sentence, which citation was served on him by the clerk Henri of Harset. The sentence uttered by the tribunal was in these words:

'We, Jean Chapeaville, Canon of Liége and commissioner judge lawfully deputed in the undecided case which is between you D. Jean del Vaux and the fiscal Jean Villar, wishing to proceed to definite sentence, to hear which you are cited at this hour and place, with the counsel of experts in divine and human law, having before our eyes God and justice, pronounce sentence as follows:

'Whereas you, Jean del Vaux, priest and monk of Stablo, have been found, by many *indicia* and witnesses and your own repeated confession, to have abnegated the faith and religion which you professed in baptism, not only in your mouth but in your heart and soul, and to have devoted yourself to the demon enemy of the human race and to have adored him frequently in the nocturnal assemblies of sorcerers and to have made with him pact to perpetrate *maleficia* and to obtain honors, pleasures and riches and other goods of this world and are marked with his signs on both sides of your back to strengthen the pact, and moreover have put to death with poisons furnished by the demon several monks of Stablo, namely the prior Dom Antoine of Salm, Dom Perpetuus, Dom Gilles of Warseg, Dom Antoine of Harset, Dom Henri of Rahier, Dom Leonard Frondville, Dom Corbilius

Neussorge and other lay persons, namely Nicole, widow of Henry of Houffalize, the wife of the Prévôt of Houffalize and Jean de Marimon, citizen of Stablo; also to have perpetrated crimes with succubi and many wives and maids. For which you deserve not only to be deprived of office and function, but to be really degraded and delivered to the secular arm according to the prescriptions of the holy canons. In order that these wickednesses shall not remain unpunished under pretext of your priestly orders and monastic profession, but that you shall suffer some penalty in this life in satisfaction of your sins and crimes, as an example for the evil and as edification for the virtuous, we by this definitive sentence decree that you shall be deprived of office and grade, be degraded and delivered to the secular arm, as we now deprive you of office and grade, and deliver you to the secular arm, asking nevertheless the secular judges and officials, so far as the law permits, to abstain from the effusion of blood. In the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. Given April 2 about the hour of 8 in the morning.'

This being pronounced, he was deprived and degraded and delivered to Peter Oran, privy chancellor of the Prince and eschevin of Liége, and to Jean Molempeter, fiscal advocate, thereto deputed by the right reverend Dom Suffragan, who, adjoining to themselves some principal men of the Principality and prudent eschevins and honored men, the acts being gone over and examined, decreed that Jean del Vaux should be beheaded and given for sepulture to the cemetery of the Abbey. The reason for the diminution of the ordinary penalty for sorcery was that Jean del Vaux had been under accusation for five years in a dark cell, on bread and water, and chiefly that he had proved his repentance by groans and tears. Hearing the sentence on bended knees, without weeping, he gave thanks for the softened punishment and asked the prior that the portion of a dead monk, customarily given to the poor for forty days, should be observed for him, so that they might pray God for pardon for his crimes."—Ib., pp. 600–5.

This is all that Chapeaville gives us. If five years' prison helped in softening Jean del Vaux's sentence he must have been confined for three years before the Abbot acted by sending Chapeaville in 1595 to investigate, for he was only two years at work on the case. The most peculiar feature of the whole is that he says nothing of the prosecution of the accomplices. The care observed to have the evidence in shape for such proceedings shows

that it was fully intended, and his confrontation with Jean de Frouville, priest of Stablo, proves that something was done, but it is incredible that Chapeaville should not have recorded the outcome of the prosecutions of 200 more or less prominent persons, if they had been pushed. That there was but one witness could readily have been overcome by selecting some one of *mala fama* and torturing him till he inculpated others and so extended the persecutions, as was customarily done in witch epidemics. The only reason that occurs to me is that in the confusion of the war between Spain and the Low Countries it might not have been deemed advisable to undertake such wholesale prosecutions, and that the memories of the Trier madness some twenty-five years before were still too fresh to risk a similar tragedy. Perhaps also the case of the Vaudois of Arras was a warning.

North German Lands.

KÖPPEN, K. F.—*Hexen und Hexenprozesse.* Leipzig, 1844. (From Wigand's Vierteljahrsschrift, Bd. II.)

A document of 1787 (*potius* 1687) shows the formalities of judgment and execution in Protestant Prussia. It is a curious exhibition of the religious zeal which stimulated the witch-craze. Like the auto de fe it was a pious duty and an acceptable offering to God. Note the presence of the school-children.

After repeated reports, the three prisoners, who every day in the week had been watched by six clergymen and urged to prayer, singing and repentance, were brought one after the other before the court. Here the Amtmann repeatedly asked: (1) Susanne, if she had been given a demon sorcerer and lover by Ilsa, to which she answered Yes! (2) Ilse, if she had been given a demon lover by her mother?—Yes! (3) Catherine, if she had given the demon to Ilse her daughter? Yes! Then the notary, Anton Werneccius, read the judgment in a loud voice. At the same time the executioner came to the table and asked for protection in case he should not be equally successful in the beheading of Susanne and Ilse. Then it was announced that if any one had a complaint he should present it. Then the Amtmann broke his wand and the table and chairs of the court were turned over. Immediately the procession started to the tower and through the town to the place of execution. A part of the men went first; each of the three "poor sinners" was accompanied by two preachers, and they were led with a rope by the executioner, and surrounded by armed citizens. The procession closed with a number of the people bearing arms. In this order it passed through the whole town with alternate praying, preaching and psalm-singing, ending at the place of execution before

the Seehausen gate. Susanne was led around while the hymn "Gott der Vater wohn uns bei" was sung, and after her head was struck off "Nun bitten wir den heiligen Geist" was sung. The same forms were observed in the beheading of Ilse. Finally, under prolonged and continuous singing, Catherine was lifted backwards on the pile of wood, with a chain around the body and neck drawn so tight that her face was swollen and discolored. At once the pile was lighted and burned till her body was reduced to ashes, amid the uninterrupted singing of the clergy, the schoolchildren and the spectators. Thus it occurred on the Köppenberg by Arendsee, August 5, 1787 (evidently a mistake; probably 1687—H. C. L.).—Köppen, pp. 52–3.

I have elsewhere an account of the way in which the local authorities acted under the supervision of the central courts or universities, and also how the latter were misled by the former. This is well illustrated by [Köppen's account of] some witch-trials in 1661 at Lindheim, of which the documents are printed by Horst, *Daemonomagie*, II.

Some men and women had been burnt in 1650. In 1661 the Schultheiss (magistrate), Geiss—a veteran of the Thirty Years' War, and an ignorant and brutal man—wrote to the *gnädige Herrschaft* that the witch epidemic had broken out again and, if the Herrschaft desired some burnings, the community would provide the wood and defray the costs and the Herrschaft would get enough money to put the bridge and the church in good condition, and the wages of the employees could be increased. The Herrschaft authorized the investigation; Geiss chose four assessors (Blutschöppen), a weaver and three husbandmen, of whom only one could write. Arrests were made of a number of women and some men—mostly persons in good circumstances—and children from eight to twelve years old. Geiss soon reported that, thanks to the Holy Trinity, he had made a good beginning and brought most of them to voluntary confession; they desired to die, they prayed for an appropriate judgment and thanked God and the authorities for delivering them from the devil and giving them the hope of salvation. One woman had fled, but he had not pursued her on account of the costs, as her husband was penniless.

A subsequent investigation by the Reichskammergericht explains how these satisfactory results were obtained. The prisoners were allowed no defence, and some in a few hours after arrest, others on third, fourth and fifth days, with their

limbs frozen in prison, were tortured until, under insufferable torment, they were forced to confess whatever he and the executioner prescribed and to surrender all the money that he could extort, and although they mostly revoked the confessions thus procured, threats of repetition forced them to withdraw the revocations and they were miserably executed as sorcerers and witches.

One timid woman, who ran into her house whenever she saw the gaoler, was arrested and brought before Geiss, more dead than alive. She endured the severest torture without confession. At last one of the assessors asserted that she bowed her head when asked whether she had made pact with the devil and had partaken of the devil's communion. A few weeks later she was burnt.

A year before, the wife of the miller—named Schüler, a well-to-do and respected man—had given birth to a dead child. To involve him and his wife, the midwife was arrested and accused of having killed the infant. She denied, but ruthless torture brought confession involving others who were accused of having assisted in the death and in making a witch's ointment of it. Under torture they confessed to having exhumed the body, cut it up and in an iron pot converted it into the ointment. The miller insisted that in his presence and that of the pastor, of one of the officials and of an assessor the grave should be opened. It was done and the bones of the child were found intact, but the witnesses were forced to maintain silence until the six inculpated persons were burnt.

Thus far the miller and his wife had not been involved. To reach them, Geiss arrested a very old woman known as Becker-Margareth. The weaver—Schöppe—visited her in the Hexenthurm and told her if she would confess freely she should not be tortured and should be buried in the churchyard. She confessed and accused fourteen persons besides the six already executed. Then the weaver called on the miller's wife and intimated that it would be difficult to involve her, but that he could do what he chose. The miller took the alarm and addressed a supplication to the Herrschaft. As soon as Geiss heard of this, the wife was thrown into the Hexenthurm. The miller hastened with a complaint to the Dean of Würzburg, who was co-heir to the lordship, saying that in his absence his poor innocent wife had been tortured until forced to confess—among other things that she had a

witch-mark on her leg, although it was notorious to all, including the barber-surgeon of Hanau who had cured her, that seven or eight weeks before her confinement she had fallen and thus caused the scar. Immediately on his return from Würzburg he was arrested and all his property seized and he was subjected to new and unheard-of tortures until, unable to speak, he nodded his head to the questions of Geiss. On recovering himself he revoked, and was tortured more cruelly than before with the same result, and again he revoked. Then the judge, in the severest winter cold, took away the straw from his dungeon and deprived him of stockings, and he was threatened that he would be torn in pieces and boiling oil be poured over him. He succeeded, however, in escaping by night from the prison; he found shelter and protection and appealed to the Reichskammergericht to suspend the prosecutions—too late, however, to save his wife, who was burnt three days after his escape. The community at last arose and addressed an energetic protest; an investigation followed, which threw Geiss into sore straits, but he was finally discharged unhurt, although thirty unfortunates had been executed.—Köppen, pp. 54–8.

Germany is the classic land of witchcraft, thanks to its political organization, which permitted every lord having jurisdiction, every parson and every magistrate, to burn to his heart's content, and thanks to the religious division which stimulated the persecution of heresy.—Ib., p. 60.

Large proportion of the sufferers were the victims of greed—destroyed in order to seize their possessions.—Ib., p. 68.

As a rule the seigneur took two-thirds of the confiscations, one-third being divided between the judges, priests, accusers and officials. In many places the prince received twelve dollars for each witch, the judge four or five and the executioner about one.—Ib., p. 69.

When at Lindheim Geiss was accused, he protested that he had only received what was the regulated pay for his labor in money, corn and some few cattle. He had taken no part of the confiscations, but they had devolved to the seigneurs in interest; if anything had been sold they got their share. His accounts showed that he had received more than 188 thalers, charging excessively for every act.—Ib., p. 70. (Cf. Heppe-Soldan, I, p. 448.—H. C. L.)

In Zuckmantel, October 20, 1639, the burning of 11 witches cost 425 thalers, of which 74 were in fees to the officials and

325 went to the Prince-Bishop of Breslau. As the judgments were pronounced at Neisse, the Rath of Zuckmantel obtained only one-half the regular fees. In another case 4 separate burnings of one each cost respectively 145, 139, 114 and 92 thalers, or 490 in all, of which the Rath had 154 and the balance went to the seigneur.—Ib., pp. 70–1.

In Coesfeld in 1631 the executioner received in six months 169 thalers for his work on witches.—Ib., p. 71.

In Zuckmantel the magistrates engaging a new executioner agreed to pay him 6 thalers for every person besides 6 per week in addition to wood, lights, oats, straw, etc., and for his assistant 2 thalers for each burning.—Ib., p. 71.

In Fulda Baltasar Voss conducted a travelling inquisition, falling unexpectedly on villages and hamlets where he seized those who he knew had money. He said that he had sent over 700 persons to the stake.—Ib., p. 71.

Lilienthal, J. A.—*Die Hexenprocesse der beiden Städte Braunsberg.*[1] Königsberg, 1861.

Bishop Casimir Florian Czartoriski of Leslau (Poland), April 11, 1669, issued for his diocese an instruction based on that of the Roman Inquisition of 1657. Casimir refers to it to show, what experience teaches, that scarce a single prosecution of the kind is carried on according to law. The evidence accepted was worthless, confession was obtained by excessive torture, the defence allowed was but a pretence, for the condemnation was already resolved upon. He therefore ordered that no one should act as exorcist without his licence; torture was not to be used on the strength of the testimony of witches or of common fame not legally proved; arrest was not to be justified by the Hexenbad (water ordeal) which he forbade, or the utterances of demoniacs. Without reference to him no torture was to be used and all prosecutions were to be brought to his knowledge, for the Polish law of 1543 subjected them to the spiritual courts. This instruction was caused by a case in which an old woman was accused of witchcraft by killing trees with quicksilver. She was burnt after having under torture named 19 others. They were arrested and 4 of them had been burnt when a priest came along who persuaded the judge that trees were killed with quicksilver without the aid of the devil—and the rest were saved (p. 76). Whatever effect this may have had was not

[1] Braunsberg, Ermeland, Polish Prussia.

permanent, for in 1727 Christoph Anton Szembek, Bishop of the same diocese, issued another [instruction] of the same purport.—Ib., pp. 61–2.

In Posen, in 1639, there was printed a book entitled "Powolana Czarownica" (the prosecuted witch) of the same character as Spee's.—Ib., p. 62.

In 1823 the water ordeal was used in Overyssel (Holland) on a woman accused of bewitching her landlady. Luckily she sank and escaped.—Ib., p. 68.

In Ermland the first distinct utterance against witchcraft seems to be an edict of Bishop Cromer, August 30, 1589—and in this there is no allusion to the Sabbat.—Ib., p. 72.

A Landtag of 1592 orders punishment of *loups-garoux* (wer-wolves). A synod held by Bishop Rudnicki in 1610 alludes to witches, diviners and sorcerers as being well-known. —Ib., p. 73.

The laws of Culm (which were in force in Ermland), as revised in 1711, provide burning for those who renounce God and adhere to the devil; beheading for those who help them or know of them and keep silent.—Ib., p. 74.

The latest execution for witchcraft [in Ermland] was in 1747, when at Wormditt Dorothea Zeger, without torture, confessed to all the foulness ascribed to witches. The local magistrate condemned her to be burnt, but the Hauptmann of Braunsberg, Theodor von Hatten, humanely ordered her to be first beheaded.—Ib., p. 81.

He says that, although the old superstitions have not wholly disappeared among the ignorant populace, the suspicions that are here and there aroused against individuals are not of the old relations with the devil, and these suspicions bring them no injury. Even these remnants are fading away. —Ib., p. 82.

In the Braunsberg Altstadt, the first witch-burning was in 1605 (see below) and the last in 1670; in the Neustadt, the first in 1610 and the last in 1686.—Ib., p. 83.

As far as the records have been preserved it appears that from the beginning up to 1772 there were a little over 70 prosecutions for sorcery of all kinds, under which 11 women and 1 man were burnt, 17 women and 3 men exiled and the rest either fined or acquitted. In the Neustadt there were over 50 prosecutions, resulting in the burning of 27 women and 1 man, the beheading of 3 women and 1 man, while 5 women and 2 men were banished. As some processes have been

lost, however, the number of victims was probably a little greater.—Ib., p. 84.

In Braunsberg, up to the middle of the sixteenth century, sorcery seems to have been punished only with church penance and exile, but a case in 1578 indicates that then the stake was either used in the city or was popularly known from its use elsewhere. Corporal punishment is mentioned in that year and in 1583 was pretermitted only through intercession. Later, burning was almost universal, and, when the case was peculiarly atrocious, there was added tearing with red-hot pincers on the way to execution. In 1671 the council, with the concurrence of the bishop, prescribed beheading before burning, but this was not through humanity, for the discussion over it shows that some kind of superstition induced it.—Ib., p. 94.

Acquittals are rare. When torture pushed to extremity failed to bring confession, the ordinary sentence was exile and fine. Those discharged were required to take the *Urfehde* —the oath not to seek revenge.—Ib., p. 95.

The trials were usually brief—one lasted but a day; the longest was two months and the usual time eight to fourteen days. As a rule, only one woman was burnt at a time and it was rarely that three suffered together. The court expenses were met with a tax of 10 groschen on each house. When the accused came from a village, it paid the costs.—Ib., p. 95.

Up to 1637 the hot-water ordeal was used—the accused thrust her arm into boiling water; it was sealed in a bag for a few days and then examined; if unhurt, it was an indication but not a proof of innocence. In 1637 the cold-water ordeal was adopted, but in 1643 the spiritual court forbade it.—Ib., pp. 95–7.

He gives abstracts of the cases as found in the records. Some of these are worth noting:

Simon Wynnenpennig accuses Ambrosius Raff of causing the sickness of his wife. The council imposes peace on them with a fine of 50 marks for whoever should quarrel (p. 114).

Four women accused of sorcery in 1534 confessed without torture to making charms of nauseous substances to produce love or hatred—what was done is not stated (p. 114).

The Schultheiss Georg Schöneberg had some years before imposed silence on accusations of sorcery. It is renewed in 1553 and a penalty of 10 marks prescribed for infraction (p. 115).

In 1578 a youth killed a young pig of a milkmaid and fell sick. Another man took a hog of hers and his horse sickened. She was required to cure them and could not do so. She was accused and admitted everything, and was discharged with the warning to cease such things under pain of corporal punishment (p. 116).

There is an indication of increased severity in Ermland in 1582 in the entry that a woman named Breuer was in danger of corporal punishment or death on account of sorcery, when her son threatened to set fire to the town if she suffered any injury (p. 116).

The same year a man and his wife were banished because of some, not positive, suspicions against her of divination.

A man suspected of treasure-seeking is banished, 1604 (p. 117).

A woman named Regina is burnt June 7, 1605, for superstitious practices. Two others, Else Bedau and Hedwiges Farnak, as accomplices were let off with fines in consequence of powerful intercession. Then there were four, wives of the Councillors Schulz, Kirsten, Grünau and Eileletter, who fell in bad repute owing to confessions of Regina, but those who had spread the reports were punished (pp. 117–18).

Anna, a cowherd, arrested August 14, 1610, confesses under torture and is sentenced, August 19, to burning (p. 118).

The Else Bedau arraigned in 1605 is accused by a woman on trial in the Neustadt of being at the Sabbat on St. John's day. Her husband employed counsel who proved by the husband and two witnesses that on that night she was boiling linen. The judge replied that in the accusation no night was mentioned; the counsel then argued that the proceedings were null for lack of precision, but the judge overruled the plea, tortured the woman without her confessing and she was discharged, after her husband had given security that no action would be taken against the authorities for the imprisonment and torture (p. 119).

A woman tried in Frauenburg accused one of Braunsberg of having been at the Blocksberg. She confessed and then retracted—and the accuser also retracted. She was banished (p. 120).

In the Neustadt, Peter Kolpiss is beheaded in 1606 for treasure-seeking with superstitious rites (p. 143).

According to an old inscription in the Marienkirche of Osnabrück (Westphalia) there were burnt there in 1561, 16 witches; in 1583, 121; in 1585, 9; in 1587, 2; in 1589, 9; in 1590, 22; in 1592, 17; in 1594, 103; in all, 299.—Hansen, *Quellen*, p. 545, n. 1.

Abbot Trithemius, in a letter dated August 20, 1507, describes a wandering necromancer who styled himself Magister Georgius Sabellicus, Faustus Junior, who boasted that whenever he chose he could perform all the miracles of Christ; that if all of Aristotle and Plato were lost he could replace them with greater elegance; that he was perfect in alchemy. A few months before at Creuzenach he was detected in unnatural lust and was obliged to fly.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., III, pp. 197–200.

Conradus Mutianus Rufus, in a letter of October 7, 1513, alludes to a boasting *chiromanticus* named Georgius Faustus, who had come to Erfurt the week before and excited the admiration of the ignorant.—Ib., p. 194.

In the Table-talk of Melanchthon (printed by Joannes Manlius, Basil., 1600), he describes a certain Joannes Faustus, of Hundling, who learned sorcery at Cracow and wandered around boasting his occult knowledge. At Venice he promised to fly to heaven and the devil carried him up but dropped him, so that he was nearly killed. Tells the same story of his death at Nürnberg as Weyer.—Ib., p. 192.

The "Disquisitio historica de Fausto Praestigiatore, Praeside M. Joh. Georg Neumann," Wittebergae, 1693, is devoted to proving that Faust was not, as asserted, born at Wittenberg or a resident of Wittenberg and that the whole Faust saga is a fable. This Dr. Neumann subsequently attained a distinguished reputation. The disputation was of somewhat earlier date, as the edition of 1693 is a second one.—Ib., II, p. 707.

Shows that already the story was called in question.

Reiche, Johann (editor).—*Inquisitions-Acta von dem Laster der Zauberey.* (Printed as Part IV of his *Unterschiedliche Schrifften von Unfug des Hexen-Processes.* Halle, 1703.

These *Acta* consist of the original documents in trials for sorcery. They afford an inside view of procedure which is interesting.

The first of these is the trial, commencing August 25, 1694, of Elsche Nebelings, a woman of sixty-three, and Althe Ahlers, a girl in her tenth year.

The latter in the schoolroom exhibited to some of her playmates her skill in *Mäusemachen*—producing a living mouse from a handkerchief, using an "instrument" described as yellow with four feet and about half the size of the hand and uttering a kind of conjuration, the words of which she could not recall on trial. The children talked about it; she was arrested and confessed readily, accusing Elsche Nebelings of having taught her, whereupon Elsche was arrested and put on trial. She is a poor widow. The documents open with her interrogatory, in which she admits that several people with whom she had quarrelled had called her a witch, but she denies knowing anything about mouse-making or having taught Althe to do it. On confrontation the latter persists in her assertion and the former in denial. All this takes place August 25. On August 30, three of the school children are examined, who describe the mouse-making. There is nothing else in the case. October 11 the fiscal presents questions to be put to Althe and she is duly examined on them. Then October 18 he presents his formal accusation and argument against Althe, in which he quotes Exodus, xxii, 15, to prove that sorcery merits the death-penalty. With ample learning and show of authorities he dilates upon the atrocity of mouse-making and demands that Althe be sharply tortured with rods and, if necessary, with thumb-screw and other tortures to elicit the full truth as to herself and Elsche Nebelings.

As Althe is a minor she is provided with a curator who presents an equally elaborate argument for the defence, urging with much force her youth and simplicity and suggesting that the mouse-making was a trick or a phantasy—her innocence being shown by her exhibiting it to her schoolmates, even if it was sorcery. One of his arguments is remarkable—"Dass absurdum fere sey aliquem in caput alterius zu torquiren."

To this the fiscal replies. He quotes authorities to prove that in sorcery a child two years old can be subjected to inquisition and that a boy of twelve has been beheaded. Wickedness supplies deficiency in age. Textor, Remigius and Carpzov consider mouse-making to be sorcery. He concludes by asking that the matter be submitted to an impartial university.

The curator rejoins with another argument. The fiscal replies again, insisting on torture to ascertain how deeply the child has advanced in these damnable crimes.

September 18, 1694, the judge renders sentence to send the proceedings to the juridical faculty of an impartial university for a definitive sentence.

October 1 the papers are sent to the professors, together with three questions:

1. Whether *Territio* or *Levis Tortura* should be employed in spite of persistence in confession and go no further—or whether *investigatio stigmatis diabolici* should be employed and by what person should it be done.

2. If such *stigma* should not be found, if Althe should be punished and how much.

3. If neither *Territio* nor *Tortura* be employed, how should she be punished.

The answer is directed to the *Königliche Cantzley-Rath und Justitiarium*, which seems to be the trial-court. It directs the release of both Elsche Nebelings and Althe Ahlers. The latter to be given in charge of a God-fearing preacher for Christian instruction and, without the appearance of an inquisition, to ascertain whether what she did in the schoolroom was not a mere jugglery, such as is not uncommon among children. If otherwise, the preacher is to impress her with the greatness of the sin committed and use all zeal to deliver her from the toils of Satan.

This is followed by a statement of the reasons on which it is based. Among these is a reference to the *stigma diabolicum*, which is said only to be sought for when there are strong presumptions of sorcery, so that it ought not to be used on either Althe or Elsche.

This paper is not dated, but a remark that Althe had already been sufficiently punished by her six weeks imprisonment would place it before the middle of October, showing a praiseworthy despatch of the case.—Reiche, Unterschiedliche Schrifften, pp. 585–622.

Perhaps worth describing is the following curious case illustrating the transition period during which full belief in witchcraft still existed and yet cases were rationalistically investigated and treated. It also shows the procedure and the judicial power exercised by the university juridical faculties.

In August, 1695, a youth of seventeen, named Martin Heinrich Arnold, was received in the Closter of St. Catherina at B. near Magdeburg to be employed until he could find service elsewhere. After a few weeks he told the steward that he had a pact with the devil. The Closter apparently

exercised jurisdiction, for all proceedings are carried on in the name of the Domina or Superior, the noble Sybilla Catherina von B.

Arnold was forthwith examined September 12 in presence of the Domina and the Provost Ferdinand von B. He freely confessed a long tissue of absurdities as though to test to the utmost the credulity of his hearers. He was born in Dresden, lost his parents in a pestilence ten years before, drifted around and finally passed into the service of Andreas Gutschmann, a mountebank who frequented the market fairs of the villages and who had recently cudgelled him and driven him away. At the instance of this man, some fifteen months before, he had made a pact and given himself to the devil, who appeared in human shape, clothed in black, with horses' hoofs and bear's claws. Arnold refused to give a writing in his blood, but the devil accepted in its place three hairs of his head and gave him a paper which supplied him with whatever money he wanted whenever he shook it and invoked the devil. Also he had twelve little demons at his service, six of whom he carried on each arm, sewed up in linen bands. Then followed a long array of his wonderful doings, carried by a goat to the Sabbat on the Blocksberg, killing women and making away with unbaptized children—though he never could recall the names of the villages where he had performed these feats, except that they were near Dresden, or near Pirna, etc. A single specimen will suffice. Near Frauenstein he assumed the shape of an apple, flew through a window and rolled on a bed where there were some men sleeping; they awoke, ate the apple and threw the core on the floor, where it was changed into a decaying human corpse; when the men arose in the morning and saw it they went mad and died.

He was evidently too dangerous a character to be at large; he was placed in confinement, his right arm chained to his left foot, with guards to watch him, and the pastors under the patronage of the house (of the livings belonging to it) were summoned to visit him and teach him comfortable doctrine.

September 17 a formal examination was held by the *Justitiarius* (Vogt) of the Closter, resulting in 140 articles, confirmatory of his previous confession. The papers were then sent, September 31, to the University of Halle with a request that it should consider the case and render judgment. The

Juridical Faculty replied that the confession seemed improbable and was not substantiated by any *corpora delicti*. It suggested that inquiries be addressed to all the places indicated to ascertain whether such events had occurred; also that Arnold be examined as to his sanity by a competent physician and by an experienced pastor as to his spiritual condition. It also made some investigations in places within its reach and sent the results.

Inquiries were consequently sent out, December 28, to all the places in the neighborhood of which Arnold had perpetrated his crimes, and in that addressed to the Amptmann of Frauenstein it is highly suggestive to observe the story of the apple-core changed to a decaying corpse treated as a possible fact. To this the Amptmann replied, February 20, 1696, that after diligent inquiry he could find no one who had heard of such an occurrence, and he added a learned disquisition to prove that Satan has no power to effect transformations. The replies came in slowly up to the end of March, all professing ignorance of the facts attributed to their localities, except as to some petty thieveries committed prior to the Satan-pact. No such mountebank as Gutschmann, moreover, was known.

Then Arnold was examined by a physician who reported, May 7, that Arnold was of right mind, but cunning. Six preachers, moreover, were successively let loose upon him. He wept and prayed and manifested the most sincere repentance and ardent desire to save his soul and escape the bonds of Satan and finally admitted that his whole story of the pact and of his exploits was a pure invention.

May 9 all these papers and certificates were forwarded to the Juridical Faculty of Halle with request for its judgment. To this it promptly replied that Arnold should be beaten with rods in punishment of his deceit; as his wickedness was deep-seated, he should be confined in a fortress at hard labor until there was proof of amendment, with weekly visits from a pastor for instruction.

June 15 the Domina applies to the Elector, enclosing the Halle judgment and asking for an order to confine Arnold in Spandau or Peitz or elsewhere, at hard labor until amendment.

July 22 he is delivered at Spandau.

December 30 he petitions the Elector for release, representing that he has been falsely accused of witchcraft.

February 15, 1697, the Domina replies to the Elector with a statement of the facts of the case. This is the last document.—Reiche, *op. cit.*, pp. 622–82.

In the records we often hear of the number arrested and tried, of whom only a portion are convicted and burnt. The executions make an impression and one is apt to think nothing of the others, except as showing that there was no indiscriminate judicial slaughter. Yet the fate of those who escaped was not much better than that of those who suffered, except that, if they had property, it was not confiscated and descended to their children—burdened indeed with the infamy and suspicion which surrounded all who had been subjected to trial for witchcraft. As Hermann Göhausen says (1630), "Captura enim in hoc crimine est damnum irreparabile, quae existimationem hominis illaesam esse non patitur" (quoted by advocate for defence, p. 720).

All this is well exhibited in the following case—which also illustrates the all-pervading readiness among the people to regard as confirmatory of witchcraft every trivial matter that could by inflamed imaginations be regarded as supernatural. It shows how diseased was the mental condition throughout almost all Europe during the seventeenth century.

At its date, however (1676), the witch-craze was losing its force and there was at least the form of defence allowed.

The village in which it occurred is designated only as A., but it must, from some allusions to Naumburg (then Thuringia, now Prussian Saxony) have been near that place. There is no designation of the university whose faculty was applied to for sentence, but the dates show that it could not have been far distant—probably Leipzig or Jena. In one answer from the university the date is "D. 23 Jun. anno 1676" (p. 737).

On March 10, 1676, Chatrina Blanckenstein—a widow sixty-six years old, of unblemished reputation, possessed of property, with six children, four men and two girls—sent to her neighbor, the wife of the town-beadle (designated as H. M. B.—Michel B.), her daughter to get some ashes. The daughter said she had no money to pay for it, but if the beadle's wife would send her serving girl, her mother would give her some jam—the jam, as we learn, was well thought of and in request. The servant came back with the jam; the beadle's wife spread some on a cake and gave it to her infant, a boy fifteen months old, recently weaned. The child was perfectly well, but almost immediately began to complain. He passed four worms (*Spulwürme*—qy. thread worms?) and died on the 14th. No doctor had been called in; no examination was made of the body; the mother had thrown the jam over into Bl.'s garden. No investigation of any kind was deemed necessary, for the conclusion was irresistible that Bl. had bewitched the child with the jam. This was strengthened by the fact that at the funeral, while the child was in the

coffin, a gray worm with many legs and a red, horned head crept out of it and another was seen lying on his eyes. The latter was cast on the floor and despatched. The former was carefully put in a tin box and the beadle carried it to the town-treasurer, who saw it, closed the lid and carried it to the bürgermeister, but when he opened the box the worm had disappeared—the bürgermeister laughed, but the treasurer says he shuddered when he saw that the worm was not there.

The town-council had commenced to take evidence against Bl. on March 15, the day after the child's death, of which the above is a specimen. It accumulated. On March 29 a hare was seen entering the town-gate; it ran towards the beadle's house; immediately a crowd of boys and dogs went after the animal and it was told in great detail by a number of witnesses how it miraculously escaped pursuit and took refuge near Bl.'s house. Then the town watchman was summoned and deposed that on the night of March 16, in crossing the Wehrde, or square (which was not near Bl.'s house), three hares danced around him and disappeared, and on the 18th he saw three black cats with eyes that shone like six candles. Then it was recalled that a year before a hare had been seen near her house, and a boy who shouted at it became dumb for some months.

Sufficient evidence having been thus procured, she was brought before the council and examined. Of course she denied all knowledge of witchcraft. Thence she was taken to the house of the *Land-knecht* (tipstaff) as a prison and it was noted that she shed no tears nor looked sorrowful.

Then came confirmatory evidence. The treasurer deposed that when he went to Bl.'s house to make the inventory (for sequestration) he placed his inkstand on a sack of corn and while he was at work it rolled off, just as an old woman suspected of witchcraft came to the door and knocked. (As to this the defence alleged that there were three sacks of corn piled on their sides, with a mouse-trap on top. He placed his inkstand on the mouse-trap and, as he was a heavy man, he shook the floor in walking.) Then the tax-collector deposed that not long before he had collected taxes of Chatrina and put the money in his pocket. On reaching home he counted it again and found it 7 halfpence short and could not account for the deficiency.

No time had been lost in applying to the university author-

ities for permission to proceed by special inquisition against Chatrina for killing the child by witchcraft and this is granted March 25.

April 2. Chatrina's two sons lodge with the Amptmann a demand to be allowed to present a defence *pro avertenda inquisitione*. Also a protest against the imprisonment of their mother as she has ample property to furnish bail. Also a protest against the inventory comprising her property and theirs. Also notice that they will appeal to the prince and demand *apostolos reverentiales*.

April 4. To this the reply is that the special inquisition would be carried out and they could have fourteen days to put in the defence, for which the *Acta* would be furnished them on their demand. Their sister, who had been imprisoned for abusing the authorities, would be released. The inventorying was for their benefit and is not to be considered "pro annotatione."

The defence follows: it is long and vigorous, discussing the law points involved, arguing the insufficiency of the evidence and, while admitting the existence and enormity of witchcraft, exposing the flimsiness of the facts alleged in confirmation. Among these are some which do not appear in the *Acta* as here printed—that she had as *kriegerischer Vormund* (military guardian?) Andreas H., whose wife was burnt for witchcraft—that she kept a pet crow, which had been caught young, and that she had largely increased her wealth. The latter they explain by her incessant, laborious thrift for twenty years, during which she had never been accused of anything evil, while Dean Joachin R. testified that during twenty years in which he had been her confessor she had been assiduous in attendance at church and preaching, Sundays and weekdays, coming to confession with her children at least twice or thrice a year and taking communion.

This defence with the further evidence gathered is submitted to the university April 25, and instructions requested. The reply is that she shall be again examined *in der Güte* and, if she does not confess, she is to be moderately tortured and the result reported for further instructions.

April 28. It is reported that when Chatrina was taken to prison she said what, if uttered in court, would have cost her her neck. The watchman over her was summoned and examined. He says that when she was brought in he urged her to confess without torture, and she replied that she had

but a few years to live and what grieved her was that she had brought such disgrace on her children and that she had to endure such ignominy; his mate, who heard it, shook his head and said that, if uttered in court, it would be all up with her. (Thus her unconcern when carried to gaol and grief when there were equally cited against her. Guilt being assumed in advance, everything was regarded as confirmatory.—H. C. L.)

Another watchman is summoned and testifies that she said to him, "It is not right that such a load should be laid on the necks of the subjects and I must endure so disgraceful a death; I know no more, but what I say is true."

Then the *Stadtrichter* (judge) reports that the pastor of the town had preached two sermons against witchcraft. Last Wednesday (April 26), when his dung-cart was going out of the town, in passing Chatrina's garden it overturned without cause. The driver said he was driving slowly, the wagon was not broken and the accident was not caused by rightful things. The defence explained this by stating that the road there was higher on one side than on the other, and stony; the wagon was loaded with light straw below and heavy manure on top.

Then a second long and argumentative defence is put in by the children, with a supplementary addition. (Perhaps this supplementary taking of evidence may explain why the instructions of the university were not carried out.—H. C. L.)

Anyhow, on May 24, the further *Acta* and the defence are submitted to the university and its instructions are asked. The reply, dated simply May, 1676, directs that a secret examination be made of Chatrina's house for suspicious objects and, if the jam can be found, it should be submitted to an experienced physician, who should also be asked about the worms, as they are common with children. If greater suspicion arises from this, the former judgment is to be carried out; if no more suspicion results, the accused is to be examined in presence of the executioner and the implements of torture; if she does not confess, she is to be placed on the ladder (*qy.* rack?) and examined while subjected to the boot. If she confesses witchcraft, she is to be examined about her confession in two or three days *extra locum torturae.* Her utterances are to be carefully recorded, so that the punishment may be adjusted properly.

A learned physician, Joh. E., in St., is then addressed with

a brief statement as to the death of the child. He replies with an elaborate opinion as to worms. He has had a case in which a patient passed a worm a hand's breadth long, black, with legs and a red head, which was a strange case of witchcraft. Such things are rather from evil people than natural causes.

June 4, the mother of the child is examined as to symptoms as described by the physician.

June 5, Chatrina's sons appear and say they understand their mother is to be tortured that night, and ask delay. They are told that, if they will pay the expenses of the executioner's detention, they can have eight days; they agree to three.

June 7, evidence taken that when the pastor's dung-cart was overturned a man was suddenly seen coming along the road, who disappeared as the accident occurred. This was held to be the devil and was so told her during her torture.

June 9. As the sons of the accused had done nothing except to present an order from his Serene Highness that all things should be done according to law, and as the higher authorities have considered that according to law there should be no further delay, at 11 P.M. the judge and *Schöppen* (justices—I suppose constituting the Rath or council—H. C. L.) in the Landknecht's house interrogate Chatrina in presence of the executioner. She denies all knowledge of witchcraft. She is handed to the torturer with orders to do with her according to the judgment (sentence). Her eyes were not even moist [with tears].

She was taken to the ladder and stripped. Commencement was made with the thumbscrew, and the torturer said she was a witch as sure as he was born. During the thumbscrew she could not shed a tear. The torturers said the devil supported her; they had shifted the thumbscrew three times without drawing a drop of blood such as was seen with other criminals, which was a certain sign that she was a witch.

Then the cords were used. She shrieked and held her head turned half round, so that the torturer said he feared the devil would wring her neck, for he had one more example (proof) that she was a witch; it was true that they all made gestures (faces).

Then the boot was applied. She said, "I know nothing, I have nothing on my heart." She was told to confess; a few days since the devil had jumped out of her garden. She

said, "He may have jumped or danced for all I know; I cannot confess."

Then she was stretched on the ladder and at once fell asleep, till the torturer called to her so much that she awoke; she did not shriek but spoke low and again fell asleep; then the torturer burnt sulphur under her nose and she spoke again softly as people do in their sleep. The torturer said, "Now the devil is supporting her, she feels nothing; a natural man could never be so numb."

For some time she had refused to answer and went to sleep again for fully a quarter of an hour, snoring softly like a man in deep sleep, and it was resolved not to awaken her. After a quarter of an hour she awoke and began again to speak aloud and to cry, "I can confess nothing." Then she was again hoisted higher, but would confess nothing, saying she was not a witch.

Then the torturer said it was evident that she was a witch, for all arch-witches slept while other criminals could not, but he did not know what more to do; still he would try scraping with hair-cords—but she would confess nothing. As they began to scrape between the legs she cried, "I will say it"; but when asked if she would confess she said, "Ach, I cannot." After it was dragged to and fro some four times and she would not confess, it was stopped and she was taken from the ladder. It was now about 1 o'clock and the examination had lasted for two hours.

June 11. Report is sent to the university and further instructions asked.

In reply they are told not to let any of her family see her in private or bring her eatables in which anything may be concealed. The torturer must inspect her whole body most thoroughly and, if anything suspicious is found concealed, it must be carefully examined, and any suspicious spot must be tried with a needle to find if it is sensitive. As a preliminary, she should be shaved all over by two women. She is then to be interrogated; her answers and what results from the whole to be carefully recorded and forwarded for consideration and decision.

June 20. In presence of the torturer she is asked if she will confess to being a witch. She replies that she is not and never has been a witch. The torturer is then told to do his duty. He cuts off the hair of her head and armpits and finally of her whole body and inspects her carefully all over. She said,

"You may look at me where you will, there is nothing anywhere." She added, "I rely on God my creator and Christ Jesus my Savior," but she did not shed a tear nor were her eyes moist. On the right of her back there was found a blue spot, which she said was a whortleberry that she was born with; her mother, when pregnant, had wanted to eat whortleberries. The torturer thrust a needle into it and reported that a little blood followed. After the torturer had completed his inspection and found nothing else she was interrogated and persisted in denial.

Report of this is sent to the university, including an offer she had made of a piece of land if they would discharge her.

June 23. The reply is that nothing further "vor dieses mahl" is to be done with Chatrina except to discharge her, after she takes the *Urphede* for her imprisonment. She is to pay the costs, moderately assessed.

June 27. The tipstaff's wife reports that her maid, a girl of eleven, saw Chatrina with a pot, out of which she ate flesh that looked like a chicken-bone. Her watcher had seen no one bring her a pot. Chatrina, on being asked, denied that she had a pot; the child persisted in asserting it; who knows whether her spirit brought it to her?

June 28. Chatrina's sons desire to hasten their mother's release by paying the costs. According to the *Sportul-Ordnung* and the custom of the town they are reckoned at 70 thalers. (A large sum for the period. It seems hard to make a person declared innocent pay for her two torturers. There was also her advocate, Johann B.—H. C. L.)

July 16. The tipstaff's wife reports that, when the witch Anna Maria C. was recently tortured, Chatrina asked her in the morning whether C. had confessed more, and on her saying no, Chatrina replied, "It is enough to condemn her to death." (Shows that there was another trial on foot and that the progress of these affairs was a matter of common knowledge and gossip.—H. C. L.)

July 16. The sons appear with the advocate, Johann B., who inspects the statement of costs and makes no objection to it and asks for a copy. The sons ask for delay until Martinmas (November 11) and offer 5 acres of land as security for the immediate discharge of their mother. Her board for four weeks, amounting to 2 th. 3 gr., is added and it is agreed that one-half shall be postponed till Michaelmas on their pledging the 5 acres. Presumably she is discharged.

This ends the trial, but not the record. January 26, 1677, Michel Blanckenstein complains of M. H. Sch. that, when his girl asked him for milk, he replied that he would give no milk to a pack of witches. M. H. Sch. makes an attempt to explain—and then breaks out. His son had been made dumb by passing a hare sitting at Chatrina's door. No one in the street could succeed in making brandy when Chatrina had begun to make brandy. She might have been acquitted or not, but people say strange things of her and even her children say that she has the *Drache* (the smoke-dragon, I presume. A popular phrase when people grew suddenly and mysteriously rich was "er habe den Drachen," or in Saxony "den Koboldt"—meaning a familiar spirit. See Melchior Goldast, Rechtliches Bedencken von Confiscation der Zauberer u. Hexen-Güther, Bremen, 1661, p. 70.—H. C. L.) Then follow sundry examinations of her grandchildren and others, in which there emerges talk about a dark man with a plume who came to the house bringing sausage, butter and cheese. Evidently belief in her being a witch was ineradicable and every trifle was held to confirm it. She took warning by her bitter experience and disappeared, which was another proof.

February 21. The magistrates apply to the university, sending the *Acta*, pointing out the no small new evidence and asking whether they shall send out warrants and seek to capture her and, if arrested, proceed with the inquisition. To this the reply was that in the absence of stronger proofs no steps were to be taken.—Reiche, *op. cit.*, pp. 682–746.

She must have returned, for she died in her bed and had Christian burial, but the clapper of the bell broke while tolling for her, as was recalled in the trial of her daughter.—Ib., p. 761.

This was not the end of the tragedy. The mother's reputation was transferred to her daughter, M. L. Blanckenstein, then a married woman of forty-four, but separated from her husband, who lived in Güsten, in Anhalt. He said he was tired of having the boys in the street call him the witch-king.

May 16, 1689, in Altendorf (is this the name of the place where Chatrina lived? It is designated in the *Acta* with the initial A) a potter named Fr. Br. appears and accuses the daughter, M. L. Bl., of having bewitched his child to death. It was nine months old and died May 1 after four weeks illness. There was nothing to connect her with it except that she was

dunning him sharply for a debt of 30 thalers. There was also a dispute about a silver thaler which he had given or lent to her long before and which she had never returned. He also attributed to her the death of his chickens and of three horses which had successively died on his hands. Subsequently his wife gave in evidence that once when she was in the house an oven full of pots went wrong and they were all burnt so that they broke.

His evidence is formally taken. Then the town secretary recalls that nine months before, when the Council sent a soldier to levy on her property for the *Services*, immediately the soldier's eye began to swell and a lump formed the size of a double fist. The corporal advised him to go to her house and threaten her. He did so and threatened to cut her in pieces, and the next day his eye got well. The tipstaff, in whose house the soldier was billeted, confirms this.

May 8. On this informal testimony the *Acta* are sent to the university.

Without awaiting reply the authorities proceeded.

May 17. The tipstaff reported that he had collected from M. L. Bl. the assessed sum 1 th. 12 gr. and had purposely wrapped it up by itself, but when he opened it the next day there were 25 pf. missing. Also he found that she was packing up her things and was sure she was going to her husband in Güsten, Anhalt. She was therefore summoned, examined, denies, and is imprisoned under guard in the tipstaff's house.

May 23 the wife of the potter is interrogated. She ascribes to M. L. Bl. the misfortunes which have befallen them for the last five years and impoverished them.

May 24 the town-secretary reports a quarrel between the Dean, M. Sch., and M. L. B. when the Dean lost a cow and a horse. Also she was seen digging a hole in the road with her hands. The Dean drove a load of wheat past this and his horse died. The Dean is summoned and confirmed this.

May 27. Widow M. B. deposes to seeing M. L. Bl. after taking communion go behind the altar, hold a muff before her face and press a kerchief to her mouth. It is at once assumed that she kept the holy wafer for sorcery.

May 28. T. Sch., her husband, appears and says he understands her friends are retaining an advocate for her. He has no objection, but it must not be at her expense; he is willing

to leave it to the authorities; he had already suffered enough on her account; the boys in the street shouted, "There goes the witch-king!"

May 29. The decision of the university is received, instructing them to prosecute her with a special-inquisition.

June 1. She is interrogated at length and denies everything.

June 3. Confrontation with witnesses.

The judge and Schöppen put on record their recollection of the accident to the bell at her mother's funeral. Also that two years ago her daughter at her marriage, in the procession while crossing the market-place, fell down and had to be helped up by her bridesmaids.

June 4. M. A. S. testifies that twenty-six years before, when she was about sixteen, she used to come to sleep in his father's barn and, when asked the reason, said she had no peace in her mother's house; there came a spirit there, also a man with a plume whom her mother wanted her to marry. They are confronted. She denies, but seems terrified.

June 7. Her brothers bring an advocate. He goes over the records and refuses to defend her.

June 9. The records are sent to the university for further instructions. It replies that as she has long been in evil repute and her mother was accused of witchcraft, and as she is heavily charged by witnesses under oath who adhere to their testimony in confrontation, if she persists in denial she is to be moderately tortured and examined and the results forwarded.

June 16. She is examined and earnestly urged to confess, as otherwise she will be tortured. She still steadfastly denies. Then the tipstaff reports that two nights before, about midnight, as he and his wife were sitting in the room with the prisoner, a black bird, like a swallow, flew in and thrice circled the room and flew out. The wife is sent for and confirms it.

June 17, after midnight, she is taken, with two torturers, to the vault under the tipstaff's house. They are told to do their duty. As they advance to take hold of her she is urged to confess; she was silent for a long while and then said, "What shall I confess?" She is told, "If she is guilty of the death of the child." After a long silence and repeated adjurations, she says, "Yes." Then follows a long series of questions, before answering some of which she pauses and hesitates, evidently seeking to invent what will satisfy the questioner.

As a girl, at her mother's behest, she had abandoned herself to the dark man with a plume, who was a demon named Heinrich, with whom she had maintained relations ever since; she had renounced the Trinity, and she tells of the horses and cows and calves that she had killed. When asked as to accomplices she mentions several, with whom she used to meet on stated nights, in a wood near the town, where they enjoyed themselves with their demon lovers—one being a man with a succubus. But she had never been to the Blocksberg.

June 19. She is examined *extra torturam* and confirms her confession.

June 19. At 6 P.M. the tipstaff rushes in to report that during the night the prisoner had endeavored to strangle herself with her apron-band. He had gone out and the other watcher was looking out of the window for him. She took advantage of the moment and when he returned she was already black in the face, but they tore off the band and resuscitated her. She is brought to the audience-chamber and examined. Asked why she tried to strangle herself, she says for pastime. Earnestly adjured not to accuse innocent parties, she withdraws her assertions as to accomplices and says they are innocent. Then questioned as to herself, she confirms her confessions.

This is sent to the university, which returns the sentence that she is to be burnt alive. Nothing at present is to be done with those whom she inculpated, but it would be proper to make secret and zealous investigation about them.—Reiche, *op. cit.*, pp. 746–74.

I have gone through much deplorable reading in my researches, but I have never met anything that was so depressing as the blind and stupid cruelty of this superstition.

IV. Lands to the East and North.

Hungary.

"Si qua striga inventa fuerit, secundum judicialem legem ducatur ad ecclesiam et commendetur sacerdoti ad jejunandum fidemque discendum; post jejunium vero domum redeat. Si secundo in eodem crimine invenietur, simili jejunio subjaceat; post jejunium vero in modum crucis in pectore et in fronte atque inter scapulas incensa clavi ecclesiastica domum redeat. Si vero tertio judicibus tradatur."—Synodus Regia Sancti Stephani (997–1038), c. 23 (Batthyán, Leges Ecclesi-

asticae Regni Hungariae, Weissenburg, 1785, I, p. 393). This is also lib. ii, c. 29, of the Laws of St. Stephen (ib., II, p. 64). There is also a provision that if any one by sorcery kills another, or upsets his mind, he is to be delivered to the kindred (to be used at their pleasure).—Ib., c. 24 (Batthyán, I, p. 393; II, p. 64).

"Meretrices et strigae secundum quod episcopo justum visum fuerit, tali modo dijudicentur."—Synod. Szaboles, ann. 1092, c. 33 (ib., I, p. 440). This is also in Decreta S. Ladislai, c. 33 (ib., II, p. 102).

"De strigis vero, quae non sunt, nulla quaestio fiat."—Alberici Compilatio Decretorum sub Colomanno Rege (c. 1100), c. 20 (ib., I, p. 455; II, p. 205)."

Batthyán says that Sambucus has solved the question concerning this by prefixing to it the caption *De Meretricibus*—but I don't see how this settles the matter.

Matthias Corvinus, in defining ecclesiastical jurisdiction, enumerates heresy, testaments, matrimony, tithes, usury, widows and miserable persons, breach of faith and perjury, and all cases of excommunicates—but says nothing about sorcery or witchcraft, which would indicate that the latter had not yet spread to Hungary.—Synodus Regia Mathiae I, 1462 (Batthyán, I, p. 502–3).

Ladislas II in 1492 enumerates, nearly as above, the subjects of ecclesiastical jurisdiction and specifically adds: "et praeter illas alias causas, quae prophanae non essent, in foro spirituali nulla causa tractetur et e converso."—Synodus Regia Vladislai II, ann. 1492, c. 14 (ib., I, p. 533).

Ladislas was king of Poland and of Bohemia also.

Three cases—treason, infidelity, and homicide—are enumerated in which clerics can be put to death. There is no mention of witchcraft.—Synod. Reg. Ladislai II, ann. 1514, P. II, c. 8 (ib., I, p. 585).

This is all that I can find bearing directly or indirectly on the subject in Batthyán's Vol. I, which carries the Hungarian documents into the eighteenth century.

In 1279 a national council at Buda, under the presidency of the papal legate, issued an exceedingly long and detailed decree as to the lives, morals, and discipline of the clergy and also of the laity as to concubinage, strumpets, adultery, etc.; but there is in it no allusion to sorcery or witchcraft.—

Synodus Nationalis Budae celebrata, ann. 1279 (Batthyán, II, pp. 433–57).

So in 1309 Frater Gentilis, papal legate, issues a number of decrees in the Council of Buda, but there is no allusion to sorcery.—Constitutiones Fratris Gentilis (ib., III, pp. 21–140).

So also in 1382, Statuta Synodalia Demetrii Archiepiscopi Strigoniensis (ib., pp. 258–79).

In the searching visitation of the chapter of Gran in 1397, the 37th question is: "Item si sint aliqui incantatores vel venefici vel alii talia committentes? et si sunt (sic) aliqui usurarii et adulteri et qui sunt illi?" To which the answer is: "Ad XXXVII responderunt ipsis non constare aliquem esse in Parochia castri."—Ib., III, pp. 301, 329.

The Synodus Regiae Bosniensis, under the presidency of the papal legate, pronounces punishment for various crimes and offences, among which sorcery is not alluded to.—Ib., III, p. 451.

Dionysius, Card. Archbishop of Gran, in defining the limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, says nothing about sorcery or witchcraft.—Ib., p. 452.

In the elaborate Constitutiones Synodales of the same archbishop in 1450 there is no allusion to sorcery.—Ib., pp. 466–91.

The 43 canons of the Synod of Zipferhaus (Scepusiensis), while not sparing the peccadillos of the priesthood, are silent as to sorcery.—Ib., pp. 507–18.

The Synod of Gran in 1489 adopts a long series of constitutions, embracing full details *de vita et moribus clericorum*, but has nothing about sorcery.—Ib., pp. 546–64.

Möstl, Franz.—*Ein Szegediner Hexenprocess.* Graz, 1879.

After enumerating the brief laws concerning *strigae* (whatever that term may mean) of St. Stephen, St. Ladislas and Coloman (which I have elsewhere—H. C. L.), he says that the Inquisition was not introduced into Hungary and that though these laws were carried through the successive statute books there are no records of witch persecution during the Middle Ages (p. 10).

The Ofner Stadtrecht (1244–1421) prescribes that sorcerers and witches, for a first offence, are to stand from morning till noon in a public place, wearing a Jew's hat on which angels are painted, and then abjure their errors. For relapse, however, they are to be burnt like heretics (pp. 10–11).

Ofen is Buda. These provisions remain unaltered in the fifteenth century recensions of the code, but there are no records of persecutions during that century and there are very meager accounts of it in the sixteenth. In the seventeenth it becomes more frequent and is fully provided for in the criminal code of Ferdinand III, 1656 (p. 12).

In 1656 at Grosswardein appeared Joh. C. Mediomontanus's "Disputatio theologica de Lamiis et Veneficis," which shows the belief thoroughly developed—although there are *Lamiae bonae* who cure the sorceries of the evil ones, not always, however, without injury to the soul. The *Lamiae veneficae* (whom he also calls *Xurguminae* and *Bruxae*) have pact with the devil and worship him as God, and though what they believe of their own doings is often mere fantasy, yet their acts, whether real or imaginary, are punishable. Their place of assembly is on the St. Gerhardsberg near Ofen, to which they go with banners and sound of drums and trumpets (this military apparatus is peculiar to Hungary—it appears nowhere else, pp. 24–5) and have plentiful banquets and dances. He has full faith in the Malleus, but admits that the confessions are untrustworthy in details, as extorted by torture (pp. 13–14).

About 1615 there was a large number of witches (male and female) burnt because they had sought with incantations to destroy all Hungary and Siebenbürgen with hailstorms. (Wlislocki, *Aus dem Volksleben der Magyaren*, p. 107, places this in 1616.—H. C. L.) This was accidentally discovered through a man in his vineyard bewailing the drought, when his little daughter of ten or twelve years said that she could bring rain and even hail, and at his request she at once brought an abundant shower on his vines, without wetting those of his neighbors. He asked who had taught her and she said her mother. He reported to the authorities and a large number of accomplices were revealed who suffered the penalty. The chronicler says there would have been the greatest danger had this remained undiscovered, for nothing would have been left of the harvests and vines in Hungary and Siebenbürgen (pp. 14–15).

It was in 1728 that the best-known holocaust was offered in Szegedin. Of this, Möstl (p. 25) only gives briefly (with some useless commentaries) the account which is already to be found in Böhmer, who quotes from a contemporary journal.

According to this journal a shoemaker's son, playing in the street with another boy, talked of bringing a great storm and asked the other to join him and he would teach him, which was refused. The other boy returned home and during dinner there came a violent tempest which levelled the vineyards. The boy's father said it was unnatural and must have been made; when the son repeated the talk and the father reported it to the authorities, who arrested the shoemaker's boy; he confessed and implicated others who were arrested and the circle of suspects widened, among them the highly respected Stadt-Richter, eighty-two years old, and his wife. An eye-witness on July 26, 1728, reports that on that day there were burnt 13 persons, 6 men and 7 women. They had all been sharply tortured and after judgment, to confirm their guilt, they were put to the water ordeal, when they all swam. Then the weight ordeal was tried, when a large and fat woman weighed only $1\frac{1}{2}$ drachms, and her husband, who was not small, 5 drachms, and of the remainder none weighed over 1 penny-weight 3 drachms. (See *Superstition and Force*, pp. 332, 335.—H. C. L.) The burning is described as a most painful spectacle. Outside of the town, three large stakes were erected, with piles of wood, to each of which four of the condemned were bound. One girl, who had been in the band and had no witch-mark, was beheaded. The piles were simultaneously lighted and, though the victims lived in the flames for a quarter of an hour, not a single shriek was heard from them, so that many doubted their salvation, although they had manifested full repentance to the priests. Among them was the old Stadt-Richter and also a Hungarian midwife who had baptized 2000 infants in the devil's name. Eight more were in prison, who had undergone the ordeals of water and the scales, and yesterday 20 more were arrested.—J. H. Böhmer, Jus Eccles. Protestantium, V, pp. 608–10.

Another account tells us that gunpowder was tied around their necks; they tried to escape in the shape of toads, mice and rats, but they were swept back and burnt, without uttering a cry or shriek.—Wlislocki, Aus dem Volksleben der Magyaren, p. 114.

Möstl adds (p. 25) that the persecution continued until the number of victims reached 34, the last ones being 3 women and 1 man, burnt in July, 1729.

An island in the Theiss, near Szegedin, was known as the *Boszorkany sziget*, or Witch Island, where a woman of good standing was burnt in 1746 after a formal trial.—Möstl, p. 26.

There were witch-trials in 1739 at Arad and Gyula, in 1741 and 1744 in Karpfen, in 1743 at Horenicz and in 1745 in County Szathmar.—Ib., pp. 26–7.

In spite of the deterrent legislation of Maria Theresa witch-trials continued and a series of them are reported between 1756 and 1766. Stephan von Sandor relates having witnessed the execution of a witch in 1775: a persistent summer drought was ascribed to witchcraft; the judge, with the knowledge of the presiding judge and parish priest, imprisoned all the poor old women of the village and tried them by the water ordeal in the river Waag; one who floated was decreed guilty and was forced to confession by scourging; a pile was built and she was burnt. Even in the last decennium of the eighteenth century there were witch trials and the belief continues to the present time. In County Marmaros the summer of 1874 was dry; the peasants of Dombo ascribed it to witchcraft and seized four old women and carried them to a high bank to throw them into the river; their tears and pleadings obtained that they should enter the water themselves, when they remained there until in the afternoon a heavy rain fell, thus confirming the peasants in their belief. One of the women became insane, another fled from the place and the other two went into hiding, while the peasants took the church bells and dipped them in the river to get the rain to cease. About the same time in Krassnahora all the women and maidens were made to undergo the water ordeal, while the church bells were rung, to discover who were witches; luckily none were drowned (pp. 30–2).

Wlislocki, Heinrich von.—*Aus dem Volksleben der Magyaren.* München, 1893.

In his chapter on Hexenglaube, pp. 104–7, he commences with the laws of St. Stephen, etc., the law of Ofen, etc., and gives nothing noteworthy that I have not already in Müller and Möstl—except that he says there is the first trace of witch-trial in 1517, when two women of Tehany accused a certain Joh. Török of perjury (what has this to do with witchcraft?—H. C. L.), "aber Gesetze und Decrete bezüglich des Verfahrens bei einem Hexenprocess gab es damals noch nicht." But with Protestantism there came to Hungary the special witch-process in the 1577 Visitationsartikel of the Saxon Protestants of Siebenbürgen (see Müller).—Ib., p. 106.

Then he turns to the present beliefs of the Magyars (p. 107).

Notwithstanding this he proceeds with details drawn from the Szegedin trials (evidently of 1728–9—H. C. L.). Most of these are the commonplaces of witchcraft, but one peculiarity is that the witch on dying can bequeath her art and power to another woman (p. 108). The question is often put whether the pact is verbal or written and the answer generally is, "Both" (pp. 108–9). The witch-mark often could not be found, but frequently the report is "repertum est stigma in loco pudendo ex parte dextra inferius." It was usually in the shape of a chicken's foot and was insensible and bloodless (pp. 109–10). In the Sabbat on St. George's day on the Kecskemeter Berg a vine stalk would be plugged and enough wine would flow to satisfy the 3000 present (p. 111). The Szegedin trials show the witch craze fully developed in all details as to the Sabbat. There is a story of a man who crawled into a barrel; a witch bestrode it and flew to the Sabbat; the man emerged and filled the barrel with salt (which was plentiful on these occasions) and crawled back. The witch flew back on it and he produced the salt as evidence against her (pp. 111–12). (Probably he was cheating the salt-tax and forged the story to clear himself.—H. C. L.) The chief place of assembly was the so-called Blocksberg near Budapest (this must be a second one—the Blocksberg, or Brocken, was in the Harz Mts.—H. C. L.) Then there were the mountains Kopasztetö near Tokay and the Öt halom and the Vaskapu, both near Szegedin (p. 112). The witch-folk had a military organization, divided into companies, with corporals, standard-bearers, lieutenants and captains—the devil being the commander-in-chief (p. 112). They could transform themselves at will into wolves, cats, swine, asses, cattle and dogs and resume human shape instantly (p. 113). In a trial at Felsöbány a witness swore that he saw a black greyhound slinking into the hay; then it took the shape of the accused, Katharine Fazekas; "she *belastet* (overpowered?) my whole body and changed herself into a white greyhound" (pp. 113–14). Witches often appear at night in shape of black beetles and in some places the sphinx is known as the witch-butterfly (p. 114). According to Mediomontanus (1656) they assume the form of plants and often of wagon-wheels. In one case a wheel came rolling into the house of a peasant; he fastened it by one of the spokes to a beam with a rope, when it assumed the shapes of different beasts and finally that of the witch on trial (p. 115). Witches change into

horses, brooms, fire-tongs, sticks, barrels and men, on which they fly through the air. They also have an ointment with which they rub themselves and fly. A servant wished some grease to rub in the necks of his oxen chafed with the yoke; he took some ointment from the closet of his mistress, but when he applied it the oxen flew away. On his reporting this to his mistress she seized a fire-shovel, anointed it and on it flew after them and drove them back. Modern superstition attributes to this salve all the powers of witches; they can only operate when rubbed with it; they must apply it every seventh, seventeenth, twenty-seventh, etc., year (p. 115).

These beliefs still exist. Every real witch in the morning changes her husband into a horse and rides to the fields, where she gathers dew and drinks it, which preserves her youth while her husband dries up. On St. George's day they gather dew into vessels, which enables them to destroy harvests and to bring rain at will. They can make milch cows dry. If they sprinkle dew on meal the bread will be blood-red (p. 117). They can transfer their neighbor's harvest by filling the skull of a horse or ox with earth from his field and burying it in their own (p. 118). They can convey milk from their neighbors to themselves (p. 118).

Modern belief confers on witches all the powers ascribed to them of old, to cause disease and death (p. 119). They often steal children and replace them with their own—*Wechselbalg* (p. 120). They can render men impotent and women barren (p. 120). In many places the bride on her wedding day casts amulets or charms into the brooks so that witches can work no evil with the waters (pp. 120–1).

But helpful sorcery is as current as harmful; witches can resuscitate the dead; there is a case of Barbara Hesen, a midwife, who by breathing on him restored to life the son of L. Vak Seele, who had been dead for three days (p. 121). There is full belief in their powers of divination and foreknowledge. They are consulted as to stolen things (p. 121). They can bewitch persons at a distance and make amatory philtres (p. 122).

There must at times have been extensive persecutions. Möstl quotes from the Hungarian historian Bél: "Pauci anni abiere dum qualicunque indicio septuaginta plus minus femellas corripi, raptarique ad aquae experimentum jussere magistratus. . . . Quae suo pondere subsidere coepit, tamquam insontem . . . dimittebant liberam. Contra quae ritu anatum

innatabant neque poterant mergi, damnabantur criminis, luculento demum rogo exurendae."—Ib., p. 123.

[A. Kamáromy published at Budapest, in 1910, for the Hungarian "Akad. d. Wissenschaften," so says the *Theologischer Jahresbericht* for 1912 (pp. 636, 638), an "Urkundenbuch ungarländischer Hexenprozesse" (for the Hungarian title, see the J.-B., as above). Of Vol. I (which alone appeared in 1912) the *Jahresbericht* says: "Dem Urkundenmaterial schickt K. ein Uebersicht über die Entwicklung des Hexenglaubens und der Hexenprozesse im In- und Auslande voraus, wobei er auch die Unterschiede zwischen in- und ausländischem Verfahren hervorhebt. Bemerkenswert ist, dass in Ungarn erst seit 1580 gegen Hexen amtlich vorgegangen wurde, während bis dahin erst auf Privatklage hin das gerichtliche Verfahren eingeleitet wurde. Die Sammlung bezieht sich bloss auf sieben Komitate, vier Städte und zwei ehemalige Szeklerstühle. Das Material umfasst die Zeit von 1565–1756. Von 554 Angeklagten wurden 169 zum Scheiterhaufen verurteilt, 23 geköpft, die übrigen bis auf 151, deren Schicksal unbekannt ist, wurden mit körperlichen und sonstigen Strafen belegt." See also Marczali's study in the *Ungarische Rundschau*, I, i (1912).—B.]

Transylvania.

Müller, Friedrich.—*Beiträge zur Geschichte des Hexenglaubens und des Hexenprocesses in Siebenbürgen.* Braunschweig, 1854.

Müller designates himself on the title-page as "Gymnasiallehrer in Schässburg" (Segesvar), so that he is presumably familiar with the region.

As Transylvania is the southeastern section of Hungary, he goes back to the legislation of St. Stephen, St. Ladislas and Koloman, where there is a distinction between *striga* and *venefica*. From the conjunction in the decree of Ladislas of *meretrices* and *strigae* he draws the conclusion that the *striga* was a less obnoxious person than the *venefica* and thence that the well-known dictum of Koloman (who represents the highest culture of the period), "De strigis vero quae non sunt nulla quaestio fiat," loses much of its importance (pp. 8, 9). In fact, it would be a mistake to assume that witches, as known in the fifteenth and subsequent centuries, were part of the early Hungarian superstitions. Koloman in fact ordered *venefici* to be judged by archdeacons and counts—by both

secular and spiritual judges—showing that he was not superior to belief in sorcery.

As the Inquisition was not introduced into Hungary, the Hexenprocess made no progress in the latter half of the Middle Ages. The provisions against witchcraft continue in the law books from century to century, and the absence of all notice of punishments decreed against it indicate that they were rarely employed.

But at the close of the medieval period the conception of witchcraft was altered in Hungary as in all other Catholic lands. The Church identified heresy and witchcraft and under the name of the latter persecuted opposition to its institutions. The bull *Summis desiderantes* (1484) gave an impetus to the hitherto irregular persecution and the Malleus brought the whole matter into a system.—Ib., p. 10.

Witchcraft (sorcery) and heresy were identified early in the fifteenth century. The Stadtrecht of Buda, of which the latest recension is of 1421, provides that witches and sorcerers for a first offence shall wear a Jew's hat with angels painted on it and stand in a populous place from morning till noon, and be dismissed on taking an oath to abandon their errors. If apprehended again, they are to be burnt like heretics. The retention here of the old lenciency would seem to show that the article was inserted (or retained) more as a matter of form than of practice, indicating that systematic persecution had not yet begun (p. 11). The next century saw it fairly established and how long it endured in Hungary is seen when, July 23, 1728, at Szegedin 6 men and 7 women were burnt alive near the Theiss. They had been duly tested by the water ordeal, when they floated like corks, and then in the balance, where a big, fat woman weighed less than an ounce. One woman was beheaded before burning. One of the men was a city magistrate, eighty-two years old, and one of the women a midwife who had baptized more than 2000 infants in the devil's name. They were denounced by a young shoemaker who had brought a destructive hailstorm on the vineyards and who was betrayed by a boy. In 1730 a fat magistrate was burnt because he weighed only a few drachms. In 1739 the water ordeal was used on witches around Arad and Gyula. In 1744 three witches were burnt at Karpfen.—Ib., pp. 11–13.

In 1672 Nicolaus Drapitz at Legnitz, eighty-three years old, foretold that in 1740 the male line of the House of Austria

would become extinct. His tongue was cut out; he was torn with hot pincers and beheaded.—Ib., p. 31, n. 56.

It would seem that Siebenbürgen is not precisely the same as Transylvania, but is a large part of the latter, known also as Sachsenland, consisting of the seven cities which Geisa II of Hungary, c. 1150, allowed to be settled by immigrants from Germany, promising them that they should enjoy their ancestral laws and customs, to which they steadfastly adhered. After the above account of witchcraft in Hungary the author turns to it in Siebenbürgen.

The Emperor Joseph I in the "Neue peinliche Hals-Gerichts-Ordnung vor das Königreich Böheim, Markgrafthumb Mähren und Herzogthumb Schlesien" published July 16, 1707, breathes the full rigor of the Malleus against sorcery and witchcraft.—Ib., p. 13.

There is a mythical Menenges who leads the aërial flight by night to the Sabbat on the Stony Mountain.—Ib., p. 14.

Prior to the sixteenth century there are no definite traces of witchcraft in Transylvania. Decrees of the Archbishop of Grau, defining ecclesiastical jurisdiction in 1447 and 1450, include heresy, but say nothing about sorcery or witchcraft.

In the fifteenth century, when witch-trials were multiplying elsewhere throughout Europe, there is not a single one to be found recorded in Siebenbürgen.—Ib., p. 16.

In the sixteenth century the connection with Hungary was sundered. Native houses of Magyar race seized the throne and for 150 years ruled disastrously. Disorder gave opportunity for the introduction of the Reformation (and Protestantism became predominant—H. C. L.).—Ib., p. 17.

Still in the sixteenth century there is no mention of practical witch-burning. The two churches were too busy in fighting each other to trouble themselves about sorcery, except as a weapon of offence against each other. In the Visitationsartikel of the Protestants, agreed to by both clergy and laity, in 1577, there is included the sorcery of old women and what is of the devil's spirit, penance, divination, blessing for diseases, which the secular powers shall punish with fire according to the command of God and the Carolina, or restrain with strong edicts, and until they abandon it they are not to be admitted to the sacraments. Those who seek counsel from sorcerers and diviners and help in sickness shall be fined a silver mark. All this shows that there had been no established procedure on the subject and the hesitating provisions indicate how little they dared to attack it. So in the Statutes

of Customary Law issued by Stephen Bathory (then Woiwode of Transylvania) there is no reference to sorcery, although the provisions against poisoning and murder were subsequently quoted as applicable to witchcraft.—Ib., pp. 19–21.

The impression made by this—that the secular arm was less concerned about sorcery than the spiritual—is confirmed by the article of the Synod of 1595 (Protestant): "Quicunque se conferunt ad Magos et Veridicos auxilium aut levamen morbi aliquod ab ipsis petentes debent privari usu Coenae Dominicae. Si autem Pastores qui aliis bono exemplo esse deberent, id faciant, amoveantur ab Officio per Mensem, coram Senioribus Communitatis et a Capitulo digna afficiantur poena." Observe that in this there is no denunciation of sorcerers, but only of those who sought their aid for good purpose—and no allusion to witchcraft.—Ib., p. 21.

From this it would appear that in the Sachsenland the secular action against sorcery was caused by the Church (Protestant). It was the more earnest persecutor, for the Synod of Schässburg (Segesvar) in 1593 decreed that defamed persons and those convicted of a first offence should be excommunicated, even when discharged by the secular court. Two years later the supreme spiritual authority threatened with severe punishment those who sought the aid of sorcerers. All this points to a conflict between the secular and spiritual powers. This rises to certainty when we see that in the sixteenth century no convictions for witchcraft can be found which would require the action of secular justice.—Ib., p. 22.

Deplorable sketch of the mental, intellectual and moral character of the pastors.

The officials, state and juridical, were mostly of better education and wider views—thence their opposition to persecution.—Ib., p. 23.

It was impossible for the pastors not to accept the biblical teachings as to witches and the precepts for their destruction.—Ib., pp. 23–4.

But as education was in the hands of the clergy these doctrines gradually spread and in the seventeenth century the secular officials became the fiercest persecutors, while the greater education of the clergy led them gradually to the other side.—Ib., p. 24.

A stimulus to belief in sorcery was afforded by the belief that Sigismund Bathori was ligatured by a witch, leading to the unfortunate dissensions between him and his bride, the

Austrian princess Maria Christina (De Thou, Hist. Universelle, ann. 1595, liv. cxiv).—Ib., p. 25.

In the deplorable political conditions at the commencement of the seventeenth century, the secular power weakened in its opposition to the fanaticism of the clergy and in the effort to extend its jurisdiction placed itself at the head of the witch-persecution, from which at the same time the clergy began to withdraw. Prince Bocskay, who died in December, 1606, was reported to have been killed by a philtre. In 1631 the judge Daniel Fronius was said to have been killed by witches. In 1686 the wife of Prince Michael Apasi I became insane; this was attributed to witches, a great inquisition was made and "die wilden Flammen loderten fast überall in Siebenbürgen." The leading part in this was attributed to the widow of Paul Beldi, who had fallen in 1674 in arms against the prince. She was said to have declared that in some way she would still be Princess of Siebenbürgen. She died a miserable death in prison, but the insanity of the princess continued; a witch was seen in every fly, and, when she changed her room, the servitors in advance drove out all flies; if one was seen on a piece of furniture, the table and all its garnishments was changed, and everything was brought in carefully covered with white cloths.—Ib., pp. 28–30.

After all his talk of the prevalence of witchcraft and witch-burning in the seventeenth century, the cases he is able to refer to amount to but three or four toward the end of the century (not so—see below) and these are of trifling importance, apparently not leading to execution. The clergy also seem to have slackened in whatever zeal they may have had.

When in 1615 the Senate of Hermannstadt proposed to the Synod to include in the Visitation questions an inquiry whether any one was practising sorcery, the Senate rejected the proposition, as the Senate had no right to bring forward such an article, and it adhered to that of 1577—in fact, in the few cases brought before the Senate it showed itself much more merciful than a strict interpretation of the article of 1577 would infer. So in 1682 the Synod had a case in which a man had accused to the pastor of Frauendorf as spiritual judge his wife as having attempted his life by witchcraft. The pastor heard the witnesses, decided the case as proved and called upon the secular judge (who had been present) to use the water ordeal and pronounce sentence of death. He refused, however, and only exiled her. She returned and demanded to be received into the Church again and be

admitted to communion, which was referred to the Synod. It decided that suspicion did not condemn, and the punishment must be left to God and the judges, and the pastor must admonish her not to imperil her salvation. In the same sitting the pastor of Grosslasslen complained that the widowed Countess Bethlen had persecuted the pastor of Kreisch and taken from him a vineyard which he had purchased of one of her subjects, because he had caused the burning of a witch, also her subject, without her having been arrested or tried by the secular court. The Synod only ordered the countess to be prayed to restore either the vineyard or the purchase money.—Ib., pp. 30–4.

These last cases (pp. 32–4) show a curiously unsettled confusion of jurisdiction—also the eagerness of the clergy to prosecute witchcraft in contrast with the prudent reserve of the Synod, which evades all action respecting it.

The following cases in Transylvania indicate strange variations in punishment—indicating a very unsettled state of opinion.

1639, Georgius Darotzi accuses Merten of Mehburg of bewitching grain in his barn—the result unknown.

1641, Sophia, wife of Michael Schmidt of Streitfort, accused by Johann Schmidt of murder by witchcraft—is banished.

1650, Peter Kloss and Gregor Klein, of Lebling, float in the water ordeal and are burnt the next day.

1666–87, seventeen trials of which the conclusion is not known. Of these seven are of Schässburg, two each of Dendorf and Troppold and one each of Neidhausen, Wolkendorf, Bodendorf, Radeln, Halvelagen and Deuesdorf.

Towards end of century during six years there are seven Hexenprocesse:

1695, wife of David Schnell accuses Georg Schobel of Kreuz of bewitching a calf. He takes a purgatorial oath (and is discharged).

1696, Jacobus Herbarth accuses the wife of Petrus Erman of suspicion. Fails in proof; has to beg pardon and pay fine of 30 gulden.

1699, Lieut. Joh. Aegermont accuses Georg Schobel and his wife, of Kreuz, of witchcraft. After long taking of testimoney they are arrested, float in the water ordeal, are tortured and are burnt March 31, 1700.

1700, Michael Folbarth accuses Georg Herbarth of bewitching a horse. The accusation is transferred to Herbarth's wife.

She floats in the ordeal, is tortured and burnt, September 2, 1701.

1700, Bonyta Janos accuses Simon Schnell's wife about a sick cow. She floats in the ordeal and, September 1, 1701, is beheaded and burnt.

1700, Stephan Maures accuses Hans Köllerin (qy. wife of Hans Köller?) on account of a diseased foot. She floats in the ordeal and is beheaded and burnt, September 2, 1701.

1700, Johann Hirling accused of transferring harvest by sorcery. For deficient testimony the court, September 2, 1701, orders accused and accuser to be reconciled to each other.

1701, September 2, at Kreuz, three witches condemned to the stake and burnt.

These are not the only victims and we know not how many others there were. In the Schässburg archives there are frequent allusions to earlier cases in which persons were tried by the ordeal or burnt. In 1670 and 1687 there are references to a certain Beningen who had been burnt. In 1680 an earlier execution is mentioned. In 1680–1 a witness says, "the Kessler of Glatz caused your mother to be burnt." In 1697, Stephan Hirling, a member of the council, writes in his diary, "At Kaisd a witch was burnt." In the Kreuz protocol of 1699 allusion is made to having seen previous executions. Reference to suspects occur frequently in 1670, 1671, 1672, 1673, 1674 and 1684. Earlier trials are alluded to of which we have no knowledge, as in the *Untersuchung* of 1486; in a case in 1704 reference is made to an *Untersuchung* of 1498.

The number of executions by sword or fire in the seventeenth century cannot be estimated for lack of the necessary documents; in the vicinity of Reps and Schässburg it is not difficult to assume 25 as most probably the number of those judicially murdered. This is small when compared with the slaughter in Bamberg and Würzburg about 1630, but here there were no political or religious hatreds to swell the number. The victims were all of the lowest class, the poor, the crippled and beggars—scarce a trader is to be found and no priests or teachers. The craze, however, grew more dreadful at the end of the century.—Ib., pp. 35–8.

The relation of Transylvania to Austria in the beginning of the eighteenth century had no direct influence on witch persecution, as the compact gave to the *ruler* (regent) no power of legislation. Yet the Peinliche Halsgerichtsordnung

of Joseph I of July 16, 1707, for Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia breathes the spirit of the Malleus and it was reserved for Maria Theresa in 1766 to limit it in the Erbländern. The eighteenth century brought to Transylvania the peace which had so long been disturbed and men had leisure to think of something more than bare existence. The clergy advanced in culture and foreign enlightenment found entrance. But in the warring confusion of the opening century witch-trials were more numerous than before. The secular and spiritual powers were not cultured enough to halt them. In 1703 and 1704 the pastor of Reps records in his church register the executions of witches "diabolica sua facinora confessi."—Ib., pp. 39–40.

In 1710 the pastor of Schaas preached a sermon on sorcery and earnestly urged those of his congregation who were suspect to abandon their evil courses.—Ib., p. 40.

There was still belief in possession, though much weakened. In a *Visitationsbüchlein* for Burzenland in 1710 there is an article that where exorcism is in use it can be retained, but, where it is not, there is no occasion to force it on any one. In the *Visitionsartikel* of 1737 the one on sorcery is omitted.—Ib., p. 40.

Georg Haner, pastor of Trappold and subsequently Superintendent—a man of high consideration—seems to have been a believer. In a witch-trial at Trappold in 1719–21 a peasant testified that eighteen years before he had a quarrel with the daughter of the accused in which he told her that she was a cursed witch and that she, with her parents and grandparents, ought to be burnt and that Haner made the girl ask him for forgiveness for the injury she had caused him. In another case Haner refused to admit to communion defamed persons until they should clear themselves.—Ib., p. 41.

In the prosecution of a woman named Gottschling of Schässburg in 1731 it was stated that the preacher West, accompanying to execution a woman for witchcraft, when she obstinately denied her guilt, exclaimed, "Then go to the devil, whom you have served all your life."—Ib., p. 41.

In the nineteenth century, Jeremias Stolz, pastor of Marktschelten, was a firm believer in the existence of witches, and in our own day many pastors, especially Wallachian, have the reputation of controlling the weather.

The Schässburg judge, Johann Schuller (c. 1731), was

accustomed to cudgel witches until they promised to make good the damages they had caused.—Ib., p. 42.

To the physician Dr. Andreas Teutsch, who became Count from 1710 to 1730, is ascribed the honor of having abolished prosecution for witchcraft, which is supported by his distinguished culture, his scientific attainments and his tendency to *Pietismus*. But this is rendered doubtful by the fact that subsequent to 1730 the Schässburg archives alone reveal 5 prosecutions in which 1 led to burning, 1 to exile, 1 to acquittal and the result of the other 2 is unknown. In Grossschenk in 1741 there was a case in which the accused was burnt. In Mühlbach in 1746 there was a case in which the sister, mother and grandmother of the accused had been burnt, which must also have been her fate.—Ib., p. 44.

Teutsch cannot have abrogated witch prosecutions, for in 1752 the magistrate's secretary of Mediasch sends to the royal judge of Schässburg an extract from a protocol in which Michael Knall, cutler of Mediasch, says he heard the accused rode through the air on a calf. In 1735 the council of Grossschenk discusses the duties of the executioner at witch-executions.—Ib., pp. 44–5.

Up to 1753 there are witch prosecutions heard and decided. The water ordeal was regarded as so infallible that the accused herself believed it. One who floated, when asked "Are you a witch?" replied, "Yes, your honor," and recounted how the devil in the shape of a bull carried her to the Sabbat, and pleaded in mitigation that she had been sick, had only been a witch for five years and had then abandoned it.—Ib., p. 45.

In 1701 there was an execution in Schässburg, in 1702 a prosecution there, in 1703 at Reps two sisters were burnt and in 1704 a man beheaded and a woman burnt. In 1704–6 at Schässburg there was a case against a man and wife for killing a man; in view of their having twelve children they were only exiled, under penalty of burning if they returned. In 1709 at the same place a man and his two daughters (Michael Gotsling, Sara and Katharina) were banished with threat of being driven out by the executioner if they returned, and in 1717 one of the daughters was prosecuted again with the same sentence, but she was beheaded in 1729 and the other daughter burnt in 1731. In 1712 there is a fragment of a case without giving result.—Ib., p. 46.

In 1717 the decision is significant in a prosecution against the wife of Georg Woltschner of Saas. It says that, although

in such actions, though rarely, the sorcery was clear and evident, yet it is not unknown that the superstition of the people is better proved than the facts. As now by the witnesses the *actrix*, *i. e.*, female prosecutor (see below—the witch was forced to become the prosecutor), is under greater suspicion, which if proved would suffice for fire, yet out of regard for innocence in such occult matters her life shall be spared under condition that she lead a God-fearing, Christian, peaceable life, avoiding all threatening and wickedness; but if due evidence is brought of practising sorcery or of threats followed by misfortune she shall receive the due reward. The costs to be divided between the parties.—Ib., p. 47.

This laid the foundation for progressive moral development, yet there were subsequent prosecutions in Schässburg, but only one in which death was pronounced—that of the Gotsling family, which dragged on at intervals from 1716 to 1731, and in this case the parties were so foul that their removal is no reproach to justice.—Ib., pp. 47–8.

A case in Trappold, 1719–21, brought the verdict that the charge was not proved, but that the accused, Katharina Philips, was held by the people in such suspicion that it never could be removed, therefore for the satisfying of their obstinate minds she is banished.

In a Schässburg case in 1731 the court recognized the evidence as defective and condemnation inadmissible, since in sorcery cases the clearest proof was necessary and men could not be condemned on simple appearance and suspicion, where so much, as was apparent in the testimony, arose from diseased fancies and prejudice and superstition. The other side was dissatisfied and appealed, with result not known. Another Schässburg case of the same year ended with the exile of the accused, Anna Kampelmacherin.—Ib., p. 48.

In 1748 the Schässburg court took official action against Katherina Schuttert, without an accusation, a completely novel proceeding, and the last action of this nature occurred in 1752. In few other places can the cessation of witch-trials have been earlier. In Mühldorf in 1746 there was one against Maria and Susanna Schlauderin and, although the result is doubtful, the burning of a sister of the accused, referred to in the proceedings, cannot have been long anterior. The mother and grandmother had also been burnt. In the accounts of Reps for 1714 (?1744) there is a payment for floating and torturing two witches and a third was banished.—Ib., p. 49.

Thus witch-trials came to an end in Sachsenland, but the belief continues. There is scarce a place where the descendants of those punished for witchcraft are not regarded today with distrust; the people fear and avoid them. There are houses in which the nightly Sabbats of the witches are believed to be held; their occupants abandon them and they remain empty; many places where the Sabbats were held are still ill-famed (p. 57); there are whole villages the laborious inhabitants of which have the reputation of sorcerers, especially of milking by means of the hedge-stakes. In 1834 at Bulkesch some gypsies of both sexes were punished with two hundred blows of rods for killing a child by sorcery.—Ib., p. 50.

Outside of the Sachsenland witch-trials lingered. At Maros Vasarhely (Transylvania) in 1752 the sentence of an old midwife recites the care with which the trial had been conducted and the proof that she flew through small openings in windows, up and down chimneys, that she assumed the shape of a goose, killed children, exchanged them for changelings, inflicted diseases, wrought cures, killed with the evil eye, uttered threats followed by misfortunes, disease and death—in short performed all the feats ascribed to witches, except that there is no mention of the Sabbat. She was sentenced to the water-ordeal, then to torture to reveal accomplices and to be at once burnt, which was duly executed. The whole trial and execution occupied only ten days.—Ib., pp. 50–2.

In this the water ordeal is not a test but part of the punishment. For a similar sentence see below, 1731—Katharina Gotsling.

The mountaineers of Wallachia are less enlightened and, to this day, when an old woman dies and things do not go well in the village, or there is continuous bad weather, the corpse is exhumed, a clove of garlic placed in the mouth and a stake is driven through the heart in order to give her and the people rest. Formerly the Wallachian women were dreaded by the Saxons as witches and their priests were reputed as exorcisers, but it is remarkable that there is no trace of witch-trials against Wallachians.—Ib., p. 52.

An edition of the statutes apparently issued in Grossschurk between 1648 and 1667 answers the question "Num indiscrete omnes Sagae quae pactum cum Diabolo inierunt poena capitis sint afficiendae" by dividing them into three classes, the "melancholicae," who, blinded by the devil, imagine themselves to be witches; the "realiter foederatae non tamen

maleficae," who have really entered into pact but have injured no one; and finally the "foederatae et maleficae." Of these the first class are guiltless—"morbus enim non scelus est." The other two according to the canon law are to be put to death, but in Protestantism they are distinguished; the *maleficae* are to be executed, while the *foederatae non tamen maleficae* are to be treated according to the Carolina, each case being judged according to its merits.—Ib., pp. 54–5.

Tearing out the heart and covering the skin over the place and eating children from the inside are among the acts of witches.—Ib., p. 58.

There is a very good condensed summary of the witch's doings in inflicting evil on pp. 57–60, which may be worth using.

The evil nature of witches makes them recognizable. They are wrinkled, blear-eyed, have sharp noses or hanging underlips; they can be known by their eyes or by their eyebrows growing together; they cannot shed tears, their crying sounds like that of a young child, they are afraid of men and often are marked by the devil. They cannot smell asafoetida (*Teufelsdreck*).—Ib., p. 62.

In a case in 1670 it is recorded that when the witch twice approached the corpse of an infant whom she had killed, on each occasion the blood flowed freely.

Prosecution was usually the last resort. People who suffered sought relief by counter magic, for which there were many popular methods, or by beating the suspect or threatening her with the stake. If these means failed there was public complaint and the accused sought to justify herself before the neighbors or the pastor, who refused her communion, and then, if the trouble continued, came denunciation to the authorities.—Ib., p. 63.

The common people would only proceed to formal accusation when supported by witch-finders or by the readiness of the authorities. In the trials, however, the injured party is rarely the accuser; it is the suspect who is morally forced to commence proceedings; nearly all witch-trials commence by actions for defamation. In the whole series of cases referred to above, in only one in Kreuz, 1699, and one in Schässburg, 1748, is the suspect also the accused. While in Germany already in the fifteenth century the old accusation-process gave way to the inquisition-process empowering the judge to proceed on suspicion and the fiscal replaced the accuser, in

Siebenbürger Sachsenland up through the first quarter of the eighteenth century the old accusation-process was preserved. —Ib., pp. 64–5.

The secular courts took control of witch-trials. There is scarcely an instance of the participation of the spiritual jurisdiction. Complaint is always made to the secular authorities, to which the suspect was forced through the threatened excommunication by the pastor or by the neighbors. The injured party would call her "zauberischer Donnerschlag," "Hundsart," "Trud," etc., publicly and before two witnesses or would send two neighbors to demand indemnification for damage or to expect the criminal accusation, which took the form of "I will bring you to the fire if it should cost me the shirt off of my back" or "You will go to heaven in smoke" or the like. This could not be disregarded—the party thus summoned must either placate the other or complain to the judge, otherwise he was excluded from communion and also from fire and water and all civic rights and privileges among his neighbors—an excommunication of the severest kind. The reproach that one could not clear himself of this accusation was strong evidence against him and often turns up in the witch-trials. If an agreement could not be reached, through the obstinacy of either party, the slandered one must appeal to the court, which he could do verbally or in writing, personally or by an advocate. Sometimes both parties had advocates. Usually the complainant offered to prove his complaint *sub poena talionis*, demanded the restoration of his honor and the allowance of costs. All this gave opportunity for the subtle technicalities of the lawyers, rendering the process long and intricate, to the manifest advantage of the witch. On the other hand her usual protest that no extraneous matters should be brought in was disregarded, the case might broaden to extend over husband or wife or sister; the examination of witnesses was loose; they heaped up a jumble of injuries to themselves, superstitions and reports, till the so-called plaintiff became defendant. All kinds of witnesses were received and there were no restrictions on their testimony. Even written statements were accepted, such as the prayer in the name of the neighborhood that the individual be removed. There is no trace of any exception taken to a witness—probably because, as in the Germany of the period, their names were withheld.—Ib., pp. 66–70.

If the evidence gave ground for an appearance of suspicion,

the local court was incompetent to judgment. The whole process thus far was submitted to the Council, without whose authority it could not sentence and execute. The Council then proceeded to arrest and house-searching. Thus far the house of the accused was inviolable, as that of a free burgher, but lost the privilege when his dishonesty was proved. If things found there were suspicious and he would not admit them to be materials for sorcery, the ordeal was commonly resorted to, for in witch trials confession was necessary for conviction and sentence. To obtain this the water ordeal was generally employed.

In Hungary the water and fire ordeals were in use as early as the reign of St. Ladislas (1076–95). In the witch-trials of the Sachsenland the only ordeal in use was that of cold water. The confidence in it was general; even the accused, when she floated, often confessed, convinced that the water would not receive the impure. Mill-races were commonly used for the purpose. In every case where it was used the accused floated, showing the skill of the executioner. When taken out she was told to confess; if she still protested her innocence, there remained the recourse to torture.—Ib., pp. 72–3.

Torture was not abrogated in Siebenbürgen until 1792. When used in witch-trials it is always followed by death-sentence. Little is recorded as to methods. In a case at Deutsch Kreuz, in 1699, mention is made of wrenching the legs of a man and with a woman the first grade is drops of boiling pitch, and the second, red-hot iron.—Ib., p. 73.

After this the case was ready for judgment, in which the assembled Council took part. The Statutes provided no penalty for witchcraft, but in all such cases of omission referred to the Carolina. The sentences sometimes adduce the Carolina or Carpzov or Brunnemann. The sentence of Katharina Gotsling in 1731 is that as a practising and notorious sorceress she shall, as a well-earned recompense and to terrify others, be first cast into the water and then pass from life to death through fire Here, as above in 1752, the water ordeal is a punishment to satisfy the people and not a proof. So in 1700 the judge, Frank von Frankenstein, sentences a witch to water ordeal, torture (for accomplices) and the stake.

In most cases in the seventeenth century and still more in the eighteenth death by fire is pronounced. This was mitigated to beheading before burning in a case at Kreuz, in 1700,

in consideration of confession immediately after the water ordeal. In 1704, in consideration of a large family, exile is substituted, but with threat of burning in case of return. It was very rare for the accused to escape without some punishment, if only a fine or half the costs, or reconciliation with the pastor. When the accused was acquitted the *talio* was rarely enforced on the accuser. In 1696 there is a fine of 40 florins imposed; in 1716, 10 florins—half of the legal punishment.—Ib., p. 76.

According to the Statutes there was no appeal in criminal cases—the sentence was executed without delay. At the place of execution an official inquired as to the truth and voluntary character of the confession, demanded denunciation of accomplices and then allowed the execution to take place. In Schässburg, 1701, the executioner received a gulden; in Grossschenk, 1735, his fee was fixed at 2 Hungarian gulden, 1 pail of wine, 1 loaf and 1 lb. of bacon.—Ib., p. 76.

The demand for accomplices was a repetition of that made during the trial and occasionally was fruitful. In Kreuz, 1699, Georg Schoebel named ten persons as witches; in 1700 there were seven named and this occurred frequently.—Ib., p. 77.

Poland.

In 1669 Casimir Florian Czartoriski, Bishop of Cujavia and Pomerania, issued the Roman Instructions accompanied with a pastoral letter in which he described in the most forcible terms the cruelty prevailing in the trials of witches by ignorant judges and the abuses of exorcists in the expulsion of demons. Sometimes the proofs were withheld from them so as to prevent the possibility of defence or if this was not done they were prejudged and their defence was ignored, while the sharpest torture was indiscriminately employed. The evidence of witches was received, although if they were witches they must be the capital enemies of the innocent. Under torture names were suggested to them and the torture was continued till they denounced them, while if this were subsequently revoked they were again tortured till they confirmed the denunciation; and those who die under torture without confession are denied Christian burial and are ignominiously thrust into the ground under the gallows. To prevent innumerable slaughters he forbade all judges in his diocese to use torture on the strength of denunciations by alleged witches

or ill-fame, which customarily arises on slender grounds, unless there are other proofs. No one was to be imprisoned for failing in the water ordeal (the use of which he predicated) nor on the strength of questions put to energumens or other futile and uncertain proofs. No torture was to be inflicted without the authority of the episcopal official, and all cases were to be referred to the episcopal court, for the Polish law of 1543 provided that all cases of magic belonged to the spiritual jurisdiction, and it was a noxious custom or rather abuse through which the judges of towns and villages assumed to try them. In this way the iniquitous errors would be more easily obviated through which many innocent persons were deprived of fame and life by ignorant judges, like wheat among a few tares. At the same time, as it is not his wish that the wicked and horrid crime of magic should be unpunished, it shall be permitted to the secular magistrate, after a conclusion reached by a number of theologians assembled before our official as to whether the crime alleged is of magic or not or is merely a vain superstition, to proceed against the accused according to the law and inflict on them the due penalties.

But let the judges understand that if they audaciously dare to act against this our prohibition they will, in place of justice, commit the gravest injustice and incur excommunication *latae sententiae*. And that our inhibition be observed all parish priests shall vigilantly watch and report to our officials any contraventions. All judges moreover are exhorted to devote their energies to the punishment of open and manifest crimes which can be proved and not to leave them unpunished while seeking those which are hidden and most difficult of proof. In order that these letters may reach every one, the *Decani foranei* (rural deans) shall send a copy to every parish church and have them duly posted.—Instructio circa Judicia Sagarum, Cracoviae, 1670. Reprinted by the Senatus Universitatis Albertinae, Regiomonti, 1821.

The Polish law alluded to in this, redefining the spiritual jurisdiction, is by Sigismund I in 1543. "Item ad Judicium Spirituale judicare pertinet Incantationes et Magias."—Joh. Herburtus de Fulstin, Statuta Regni Poloniae (Samoscii, 1597), p. 453.

In 1745 the Synodus Culmensis et Pomesaniensis referred to this law when it deplored the judgments full of errors and crimes rendered against witches by seculars unfitted by

knowledge and experience, who on light suspicion torture and expose to the water ordeal and other means of extorting truth women neither confessed nor convicted and by condemning them to death spill innocent blood, "as shown, *proh dolor*, by numerous examples." The constitution of King Sigismund in 1543 and the canon law show that *maleficium* and sorcery appertain to the spiritual jurisdiction. "Therefore we forbid all secular magistrates to try these cases in first instance, both on account of the law and the extreme difficulty of their decision by theologians and jurists, for which reason they are to be remitted to our official."

In addition to the above are the royal decrees at Warsaw in 1672 and 1713 by which the cognizance of these cases is wholly taken from the secular judges until after they are passed by the spiritual jurisdiction. And more recently (say about 1740) for our diocese is the rescript of Augustus III (1733–63) by which it is strictly provided, under pain of 1000 Hungarics for judges of cities, and of death for those of villages, that they shall not dare to decide such cases without previous cognizance by the spiritual judge. And although we have had this rescript published in all the parishes, we append it hereto.—Synod. Culmensis et Pomesaniensis, c. 5 (Hartzheim, Concil. German., X, p. 510).

[The text of Bishop Casimir's edict follows:]

"Universo clero et populo dioecesis nostrae Vladislaviensis et Pomeraniae, salutem in domino. Multa experientia, variis ac frequentissimis prudentum piorumque virorum testimoniis, ex datis item recenter in publicum doctorum lucubrationibus, ex ipsa insuper instructione Romana pro formandis processibus in causis maleficarum A.D. 1657 edita, edocti sumus, quod in hisce processibus contra sagas praetensas plurimi errores inveniri soleant, adeo ut (verba sunt instructionis Romanae) vix unquam repertum fuerit processum similem recte et iuridice formatum fuisse. Unde sub praetextu iustitiae passim iniquitas, crudelitas, privatarum offensarum vindicta et summum innocentum praeiudicium in fama et vita involvitur. Multi enim iudices delationibus eorum, qui se putant maleficiatos, facile credunt, quod infirmitatem ex maleficio cuiuspiam certae personae contraxerint, vel eventus aliquos calamitosos passi fuerint. Et ex tali credulitate et suspicione temeraria ad incarcerationem et torturas, immo ad decretum mortis ex confessione, vi torturarum extorta, illegitime ferendum descendunt. Cum tamen similes morbi et eventus

naturaliter evenire potuerint, deo permittente, vel in probationem virtutis, vel in poenam peccati; et saepissime ex ebrietatibus nimiis, ex luxuria, ex ciborum suae complexioni, in quantitate et qualitate, improportionatorum immodico usu, aliisve rationibus, varia intemperies morborum emanet. Hinc plurimi modos illicitos et falsitati obnoxios ad investigandas maleficas adhibent, cuiusmodi sunt natationes super aquam, energumenorum interrogationes, aliique similes vani, superstitiosi et ommino vitandi modi. Accedit, quod accusatis magiae penitus denegetur advocatus et defensio, illisque indicia contra se allata non indicentur, ne se possint purgare, contra ius naturale, quod cuilibet ad crimen sibi obiectum defensionem concedit. Quidam vero defensionem concedunt ad speciem, in animo tamen conclusum habent perdere illas, non obstantibus quibusvis purgationibus. Unde nec in decretis adnotant rationes adductas pro defensione, ut sic decretorum suorum iniquitas magis occultetur. Alii passim crudelissime sine sufficientibus indiciis ad infandas condemnant torturas, in quibus decernendis plurimos iniustissimos errores admittunt.

"1. Sufficere putant solam famam illegitime probatam ad torquendum, aut solas denuntiationes sagarum, cum tamen, si sint sagae verae, ommino debeant esse innocentibus hostes capitalissimae et coniuratae, esse quoque debeant mendacissimae; uti patris mendaciorum filiae aut sponsae, a quo saepissime aut semper illuduntur, ut videri a se putent palatia splendida, convivia lauta, personas varias, quae re vera non sunt.

"2. Non permittunt appellare a decreto torturae, quod est contra sensum iurisperitorum, et, posita hac appellatione, sententia subsequens nulla est et invalida.

"3. Novam rationem torturarum, non praescriptam a lege, adhibent, in eisque excedunt tempore et intensione, immo eo usque torqueri mandant, donec crimen, sive verum sit sive falsum, vi torturarum asseratur, talesque de se assertiones et confessiones tanquam verissimas summe aestimant.

"4. Iniquissimum etiam est, quod in torturis de complicibus nominatim suggerendo personas interrogentur contra praescriptum legum, nec dimittantur a quaestionibus, donec proclament nominatas a suggerentibus. Nec postea huiusmodi proclamationes revocandi ullus modus restat. Si enim denuntians in torturis personam a se insimulatam postea finitis torturis revocet, iterum torqueri eam mandant, ut in sua

prima delatione perseveret. Quodsi ad locum supplicii revocationem ob timorem torturarum repetendarum differat, tali revocationi quasi non sit in loco debito nulla fides datur, cui potissimum esset credendum, utpote in articulo mortis iam statim inevitabiliter suscipiendae. Ita insontibus proclamatis vi torturarum non est ratio vel modus famam recuperandi, ex talique processu insontes rogo adiudicantur.

"5. Scelestissime et illi faciunt, qui repetunt sine novis indiciis torturas, et sine argumentis evidentioribus, prout requiritur, quam ad primam torturam fuerint. Et sunt qui discontinuant torturam in plura diversa tempora durissimo crudelitatis invento has enim discontinuationes pro una habent tortura.

"6. Impium quoque est, quod ex torturis immanibus mortuas in carcere, nondum de crimine fassas nec convictas, ecclesiastica sepultura privant, et sub patibulo ignominiosissime sepeliunt. Principalis autem fons talium errorum est, quod a rudibus hominibus, qui literas vix aut modice norunt, iudicia maleficarum exercentur, sagae dignoscuntur, similes his redarguente S. Paulo I. Tim. i. Volentes (inquit) esse legis doctores, non intelligentes, neque quid loquuntur, neque de quibus affirmant. Cum negotium hoc sit difficillimum, et id quod putatur esse maleficium possit fieri aliqua naturali de causa. Ex tali autem imperitia iudicum, quam aequa et discreta decreta ferantur, quisque prudens coniicere potest, et intelligere, an iudicia his committentes vel ex officio suo non impedientes aequali ac ipsi iudices crimine non sint obligati.

"His itaque ex certa scientia habitis conscientiae animarum et caedi innumerabilium obviare sollicite satagentes, ne sanguinem animarum deus de manibus Nostris requirat, pro officio Nostro pastorali statuimus et ordinamus: Quandoquidem exorcistae, aut potius sancto exorcistarum munere plerique abutentes, similium errorum interdum sunt autores, non adhibendo debitam formam, ab ecclesia in rituali ad exorcizandum praescriptam, sed suis adinventionibus, murmurationibus, figurarum erectionibus, maleficas et ipsa maleficia quasi a se cognita promulgando, ritus insolitos in balneis, tricliniis, thalamis, adhibendo; de quibus potest dici illud S. Apostoli ad Tit. i, 'Universas domos subvertunt, docentes, quae non oportet, turpis lucri gratia.' Cupientes ergo extirpare hunc abusum exorcismorum, alias ab ecclesia pie et sancte institutorum, severe et in virtute sanctae obedientiae

praecipimus, ne quis ad exorcisandi munus in dioecesi Nostra accedere praesumat, nisi a Nobis specialem in scriptis facultatem obtinuerit, sub poena excommunicationis, ipso facto incurrendae. Quodsi in parochia aliqua non approbatus a Nobis exorcista quicunque comparuerit, parochus loci illius omnino, sub gravi conscientiae vinculo, tenebitur illum ad officium Nostrum deferre, populum vero publice edocere, quod ad eiusmodi exorcistam confugere sit a Nobis serio inhibitum, prout hisce gravissime inhibemus.

"Et praefatos exorcistas obedire detrectantes, etiam cum auxilio saecularis brachii (ubi opus fuerit) capiendi, et coram officio Nostro praesentandi reverendis decanis vicinioribus facultatem concedimus.

"Iudicibus autem quibuscunque in nostra dioecesi existentibus omnino inhibemus, ne ex solis denuntiationibus sagarum praetensarum, vel ex fama a levibus fundamentis oriri solita, nec aliunde legitime probata, contra proclamatam seu denuntiatam torturas decernere audeant.

"Item, ne ex supernatationibus super aquas (quam probationem ut olim ab ecclesia prohibitam etiam interdicimus) neque ex interrogationibus obsessorum a daemone, vel aliis probationibus incertis et futilibus, captivationi etiam et incarcerationi ullas personas addicant. Statuimus insuper, ne etiam ad torturarum decretum procedant irrequisito officio Nostro, immo causam maleficiorum ad cognitionem Nostram remittant, neque iurisdictionem Nobis debitam sibi usurpare audeant, cum expresse statutum legum Polonarum anno 1543 causam incantationis et magiae ad iudicia spiritualia pertinere velit et statuat. Sed et contra rationem nimis praeiudiciosa et noxia consuetudo, seu potius abusus sit, a magistratibus civitatum, oppidorum, et villarum, haec delicta iudicari, quae ab ipsis discerni nequeunt. Ita facilius erroribus iniquissimis obviabitur, per quos plurimi insontes, velut triticum dum pauca zizania colliguntur, ab imperitis iudicibus simul in fama et vita eradicantur. Ne vero tam scelestum et horrendum crimen magiae impunitum, quod nolumus, maneat: liberum erit magistratui saeculari, post accuratam et a multis simul theologis ad id convocatis resolutionem datam, coram officio Nostro, an crimen objectum sit magia vel non? vel sit sola superstitiosa et vana observatio contra reos, iuxta tamen praescriptum legum, procedere, eisque poenas debitas infligere.

"Noverint autem iudices, si contra huius inhibitionis Nostrae tenorem facere ausu temerario praesumpserint, loco

iustitiae gravissimam iniustitiam et iniquitatem seu commissuros et excommunicationem latae sententiae incursuros. Cui inhibitioni Nostrae ut satisfiat, parochi in suis parochiis invigilare tenebuntur, Nostrosque officiales certos reddere, si quid a quopiam centractum fuerit. Optamus denique et hortamur omnes iudices, quos fervens zelus institiae urgere videtur, ut, pro ratione officii sui, iustitiam vindicativam contra crimina, non tam occulta et abstrusa, probatuque difficillima, quam potius in manifesta et publica, et passim obvia exerant, ut sunt homicidia publica pauperum subditorum, immo et aliorum furta, rapinae, fraudes in mercimoniis, falsificationes novilentorum et aliorum vendibilium, sive victui sive amictui servientium, adulteria, stupra, oppressiones inopum iniquae, ebrietates et luxuriae, multorum maleficiorum putativorum causae, et his similia, quae facilius, sine periculo tot errorum, probari et diiudicari possunt. Turpe equidem est, praetermissis certis et publicis sceleribus impunitis, occulta quaerere; cum prius illa sint tollenda et vindicanda. Quae ordinationis Nostrae literae ut ad notitiam omnium pervenire possint, iniungimus reverendis Decanis Nostris foraneis, eas more solito cursoriae transmitti, et ad ecclesiam quamlibet parochialem unum exemplar, a singulis parochis descriptum, affigi et retineri procurent; quo diutius in memoria hominum conserventur. In quorum fidem hasce manu nostra subscripsimus et sigillo muniri mandavimus. Smarzevitiis, 11 April 1669. Casimirus Florianus Czartoryski, Episcopus Vladislaviensis et Pomeraniae."—Printed in Cracow in 1670 and reprinted in the Festschrift of the Albertine University of Königsberg at the Pentecost Feast, 1821 (pp. 14–17).

The dangers of legerdemain, indicated in the case of Veith Kratzer, which I have elswhere from Cannaert, and in a case in the Canaries (see *Inquisition in the Spanish Dependencies*, p. 166) is also shown by one in Poland towards the end of the seventeenth century. Joh. Plan, a dentist of Breslau, was in the habit of visiting the fairs in the market towns of Poland, with an attendant who played the fool, so as to attract patients. Thinking that a juggler would prove a more efficient attraction, he hired one, whom he left at the little town of Scheversentz while he went forward on his round. On his return he found his assistant's body dangling on a gibbet, with his juggler's box suspended to his neck. On inquiring the reason he was told that the man was a

wizard, for in the market place, in sight of the people, he had made birds, eggs, corn, etc., and on being stretched on the rack (Polnischer Bock) and soundly cudgelled he had confessed to sorcery, for which he was condemned to the halter. Plan, fearing that he might fare even worse, promptly made his way back to Breslau through a wide detour.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., I, p. 815.

Poland in 1776 abolished prosecutions for witchcraft.—Carl Meyer, Der Aberglaube des Mittelalters, p. 335.

Bohemia.

Wratislaw II (c. 1080) came to the assistance of his brother Gebhard (Jaromir), Bishop of Prague, in suppressing sorcery, practised by many men and women, disturbing the minds of men with their magic, drawing to themselves the milk and harvests of others and sometimes exciting storms with the violence of demons, whereby the faith of the people in God was shaken. The bishop could employ only ecclesiastical censures, for which they cared as little as for a leaden sword; but Wratislaw brought to bear not only steel but fire and water, beheading some, burning others and drowning some *Sagae.* More than a hundred such executions terrified the rest to abandon these evil arts.—Dubravius, Hist. Bohemicae (Francofurti, 1687), c. 8, p. 224.

The Emperor-king Wenceslas was less pious, with his court magician Zyto.

Sweden.

Laws of Charles IX dealing with witchcraft, 1608.—"Si conficiat vir virum, foemina foeminam aut virum per magiam aut incantationem, ita ut ille vel illa inde morte afficiatur, author vita privetur pro tali facinore, vir rota, foemina incendio plectatur, et hoc cognoscatur per territorialem Nemdam, ut ante dictum est"—Tit. ix, c. 6 (Sueciae Leges Provinciales, ed. Loccenius, Stockholm, 1672, p. 152).

The Nemdam is "duodecim adsessores judicii"—of old named by both parties, but subsequently appointed by the public authority—a sort of jury (see Loccenius' Lexicon Juris Sueo-Gothici, s. v. Nåmd, p. 110).

"Si mulier aut vir arte malefica aut venefica utatur, ille vel illa compedibus constringetur et ita in judicium deducetur, et opera malefica cum illis (illo vel illa) xii viri testabuntur (virtually a jury), num illa maleficia commiserint, vel non.

Si absolvant eos, absoluti sunt: si damnent, mulctentur xl marcis tripartiendis, Regi, actori, territorio. §1. Si quis inde mortem passus sit, et accusatio de eo instituatur, et xii viri testentur: si absolvant eum, sit absolutus; si damnent, illa ad rogi, ille ad rotae supplicium ducetur, et reorum mobilia publicabuntur, immobilia vero capient haeredes. Si quis insimuletur, nec territorii Nemda se defendere possit, mulctetur, ut in titulo de Homicidio determinatur."—Tit. ix, c. 15 (pp. 155–6).

Then in a general chapter concerning the crimes included in Tit. ix, which are *graviora crimina*, it is remarked, ". . . Insimulatus eorum (delictorum), nec deprehensus in illis, purget se, ut antea dictum est."—Ib., c. 16.

This purgation seems from Tit. vii, c. 19, to be a *purgatio juratoria*, but no details are given. It provides for the accused "qui publica fama facinoris notatur, idque negat."

Laws of Gustavus Adolphus, 1618.—"If man or woman attempts to use poison or sorcery against another and is caught in the act, he shall be tried before twelve men. If they absolve him, let him be absolved; if condemned, let him be fined 60 marks, to be divided in three portions; if they cannot pay it, let them, man or woman, be condemned to the stake, and their property pass to their heirs. If by their 'arte malefica' or counsel anyone is injured in health or life let a court of twelve men judge it; if absolved, let them be absolved; if condemned, let them be put to death as above and their property be confiscated. If accused, but not taken in the act, and not condemned by the twelve men, let the accuser be fined in 40 marks."—Tit. x, c. 11 (pp. 117–8).

Tit. x, c. 4, provides, for cases where death is caused by sorcery, death by wheel or stake, exactly as in the laws of Charles IX, but it adds that the accusation must be supported by 6 witnesses, and the accused can purge himself with 12 compurgators; but "Si deficiat in juramento, reus sit facinoris" (p. 115).

This shows apparently a mitigation in the permission to escape by conjurators.

Tit. xi, c. 2, provides that a man accused of homicide and not confessing may be convicted with 6 witnesses or acquitted on the oath of 12 conjurators (p. 119).

The same alternative of fine or death is provided in Tit. xi, c. 13, for the heir of a murdered man killing the murderer

by sudden impulse, when he is to be fined like other homicides and if unable to pay the fine to be put to death (p. 121). The fine for justifiable homicide was 80 marks (Tit. xi, c. 1, p. 118).

HALLENBERG, G. P.—*De Inquisitione Sagarum in Svecia.* Upsaliae, 1787.

An epidemic of witchcraft which pervaded Sweden in the latter part of the seventeenth century is a good example of the mingled insecurity and craft which produced these deplorable results throughout Christendom.

On July 5, 1668, the pastor of Elfvedalen in Dalecarlia reported to his bishop that Gertrude Svensen, a girl of eight, who had come there four years before from Lill Herrdal, a parish of Norrland, and had learned the art of incantation from a servant named Marit Jonsdotter, had stolen for the devil (*abstulerat ad malum genium*) several children of Elfvedalen. She was detected by Eric Ericson, a boy of fifteen, who likewise accused several others, one of whom, a woman of seventy, confessed, and the others denied. The royal officials had likewise investigated the matter and reported that these persons had visited the church on the first day appointed for public supplication, and had stolen from the sacristy some of the consecrated wine.

The pastor is rewarded for his zeal by the king, March 22, 1669, with promotion to a better benefice. May 22 royal letters are issued to the bishop to appoint some trusty pastors who with delegates from the royal council should bring back the simple multitude to the way of salvation by mild measures, without imprisonment or cruel punishment. June 15 the bishop is ordered to appoint persons to meet at Fahlun on St. John's Day to confer, and further he is to order public prayers throughout the diocese to avert the rage of the devil.

The commission, consisting of members of the royal council and leading local officials, meets. After a brief examination, lasting from the 13th to the 25th of August, they condemn to death 23 persons of whom fifteen, convicted on their own confession, are immediately beheaded, August 25, and their bodies burned at the stake. The rest are reserved for further examination by the royal council. Besides this, 36 children, who had been seduced by the witches, are beaten with rods; and 200 more are ordered to stand with rods for three Sundays in the porch of the church, and then, for a year from the 13th Sunday after Trinity, to occupy a special position in front of the preachers.

So far was this severity from curing the evil that it seemed rather to scatter its seeds far and wide. September 25 royal letters were addressed to the bishop ordering him to assemble a new commission, as the former one appeared to have accomplished nothing. December 19, other letters ordered a new form of prayer to be used in all the churches of the kingdom, as witchcraft was said to have penetrated as far as Bohusia (Bohus, Gothland?).

In 1670 several of these commissions were constituted "in Helsingia (Helsingen), praefectura Uplandiae Orbyhusensi (Örbyhus?) atque Upsaliae." The president of them was Andreas Stjernbok, member of the council of Dorpat, and a member was Charles Lund, Professor of Law in Upsala. A letter of Stjernbok to Charles XI describes the horrible apparition of the devil to himself and Lund—which was confirmed by the latter frequently in his lectures, under an invocation to God.

In the parish of Nordingra in Angermannia, two boys, one of sixteen and the other of eighteen, began to preach to other children at play, whence angelic visions began to occupy the minds of all, young and old. A royal commission thereupon made the ordinary inquisition in the parishes of Thorsaker, Ytterlannas and Dahl, in the course of which, during 1674 and 1675, they put to death 71 persons, beheaded first, then burnt. October 16, 1674, Jacob Abraham Euren, Lector of the Gymnasium of Hernosand and afterwards Praepositus Norensis, asserted that he was given up to the devil (*ad malum genium ablatum*)—as his own wife testified. In this same year many other persons were put to death on three piles erected near the town of Hernosand.

In the year 1676 the contagion reached Stockholm, notwithstanding that the inhabitants had endeavored to avert it by a day of public prayer on February 20. By the order of the royal council, the Consistory of the city, March 31, delivered its opinion on the subject, confirming in all respects the public infatuation. Examinations were made by the inferior judges and sentences rendered by the royal council, under which six women were put to death. Then the Regents appointed a royal commission of twelve members, half clergy and half laity, a part of the latter being physicians. All the prisons were crowded with the accused; many accused themselves and persisted in it to the death, and the popular excitement was kept up by vigils, fasts and prayers. Several children

and three servant girls accused a Finnish woman, Magdalen Matsdotter, of witchcraft, and her own two daughters joined in the accusations, asserting in court that they saw the devil standing beside her. Notwithstanding her denials, she was burned to death, a punishment at that period almost unheard of, and her youngest daughter accompanied her to the stake, vainly endeavoring to the last to persuade her to confess. These same servant girls then accused of witchcraft the daughter of a gardener, betrothed to a tailor, who had given her a silk dress; she confessed and was condemned to death, but before execution it was proved that they had acted from envy and that the Finnish woman had likewise been falsely accused. These and other similar cases at length showed the judges that they should act with more caution when human life was at stake, nor admit the evidence of children. The above named servant girls were condemned to death and a boy of fourteen, named John Johanson, who was supposed to have been the first to bring to Stockholm these magic arts from Gevalia and was proved to have done all things to gain money. Then by order of the king all future prosecutions for witchcraft were stopped.—Hallenberg, *op. cit.*

Christian Thomasius says that one of the assessors appointed by the King of Sweden to sit on the trials for witchcraft, when travelling in Germany, told him that he and the other assessors at the beginning easily [perceived] that there was lack of sufficient ground for an inquisition on the accused, since there was no other evidence than the fantastic talk of children and half-grown boys. But the spiritual assessors, who had the upper hand, disregarded this, while they asserted that the Holy Spirit, which strove to guard the glory of God against the kingdom of Satan, would never permit these boys to tell lies, in support of which they always quoted the Psalm: "Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy and the avenger." At last, after many innocent had been burnt, one of the boys accused an honorable man of having been at the devil's feast, whereupon one of the assessors, with the knowledge of the others, promised him half a thaler if he would admit that he was in error and had meant to accuse another person, which he readily agreed to do. Then the theologians immediately saw that the Holy Spirit did not speak through the boys, and this one was

scourged with rods by the servants of the judges; but the persecution was abandoned too late, for already many innocent persons had been executed.—Christ. Thomasius, Kurze Lehr-Sätze von dem Laster der Zauberey (Leipzig, s.l. [1712]), §46, p. 68.

This experience did not cure Sweden of the witch-craze. A letter from Stockholm, December 27, 1732, relates how a young girl performed miraculous cures by prayer and laying on of hands. The authorities of the place arrested her and sent her to Stockholm for judgment, where a judge condemned her to be burnt as a sorceress, but his colleague dissented and she was handed over to the Hofgericht, which on investigation found her to be an industrious person of exemplary life who performed her cures gratuitously, and called in two clergymen to examine her. One pronounced her to be of feeble understanding, the other, who took great interest in the case, regarded her as endowed with miraculous gifts from her close relations with God and Christ—no priest was so familiar with Scripture and her whole conduct was modest and God-fearing. The upshot was still to be determined, but she doubtless escaped the stake.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., I, p. 443.

Sweden removed the death-penalty for witchcraft in 1779.—Meyer, Der Aberglaube des Mittelalters, p. 335.

V. France.

Evidently in the early fourteenth century the persecutions of sorcerers in southern France became more active. The statutes of the see of Tulle (Limousin) in 1339 order all the faithful to report to their priests, and the priests to the bishop, all "*sortilegos et sortilegas*" of whom they may know by witnesses or by common fame, and this under penalty of excommunication for neglect. It is a sort of Edict of Faith directed against these special offenders.—Statuta Synod. Eccles. Tutelensis, ann. 1339, c. 5 (Martène et Durand, Thesaurus, IV, pp. 801–2).

There are frequent instructions to keep the fonts, the chrism and the hosts secure under lock and key to prevent their use for sorcery. Thus at Coutances [c. 1215?], c. 22 (ib., p. 807); c. 2 of a council of uncertain date and place (ib., p. 157); Autun (s.d., c. 1290?), c. 5 (ib., p. 467); another of the same place in 1323, c. 23 (ib., p. 502); Liége, 1287, c. 10 (ib., p. 831).

A council at Nantes, c. 1350, orders the "*sortiarios*" and "*sortiarias*" to be publicly excommunicated every Sunday and feast day, "quia, diabolo suadente, quotidie multiplicantur in civitate et dioecesi Nannetensi."—Statuta Synod. Eccles. Nannetensis, c. 4 (Martène et Durand, p. 961).

This is repeated in the canons of 1384, c. 7 (ib., p. 970).

The council of Langres, 1404, legislates against sorcerers, diviners, etc.; that of 1491 refers to previous decrees and repeats the prohibition of all kinds of *sortilegia et maleficia* in considerable detail, and orders all parish priests on Sundays to publish these decrees and prohibit any one from having recourse to them. But it does not stigmatise them as deceptions, nor does it say anything about witches.—Bochel, Decreta Ecclesiae Gallicanae (Parisiis, 1609), pp. 119–21.

Council of Sens, 1525. Priests to warn their people of the great sin of consulting diviners, etc. In their necessities they are to have recourse to God, the Virgin and the Saints. Nothing about witches.—Ib., p. 124.

The provincial councils held in France to enforce the Tridentine reforms—or some of them—paid attention to sorcery:

Council of Evreux, 1576. Decree against sorcery and magic and divination, which prevail everywhere; orders them denounced. Says nothing about witches.—Ib., p. 121.

Council of Rouen, 1581. Orders inquest against "*maleficos, atheistos et libertinos*" and their punishment, as the evil is increasing. Nothing about witches.—Ib., p. 122; Hardouin, Concilia, X, p. 1216.

Council of Rheims, 1583. Threatens the penalties of the law and arbitrary ones for using Scripture texts for incantations and divination. Excommunication for soothsayers, for ligature of married folk and for other injury to persons. Nothing about witches.—Bochel, p. 123; Hardouin, p. 1280.

Council of Bordeaux, 1583. Priests to constantly warn their flocks that those using magic arts, astrology and divination commit execrable wickedness and are expelled from communion, for God hates all this and for it the nations are exterminated from the face of the earth. Nothing about witches.—Bochel, p. 123; Hardouin, p. 1342.

Council of Tours, 1583. In view of the number of magicians, enchanters, *malefici* and superstitious persons, orders priests to teach the people that these things can work no benefit, but are only hidden snares of the ancient enemy to

lead men to perdition. Silent on the subject of witchcraft.—Bochel, pp. 122, 123; Hardouin, pp. 1396–7, 1406.

Council of Bourges, 1584. Forbids the use of Scripture phrases in diabolical invocations and divinations (tit. iv, c. 3). Also quotes the command "Maleficos non patieris vivere" and condemns "omnes ariolos, incantatores, sortilegos et eos maxime qui nomine Dei et rebus sacris in hujusmodi superstitionibus abutuntur." If clerics, to be degraded and handed over to the secular arm; if laymen, to be excommunicated and denounced to the judges. Ligatures it pronounces to be mere deception and excommunicates those who practice such superstitions. It says nothing about witches (tit. xl).—Hardouin, pp. 1464, 1501.

Council of Aix, 1585, has nothing to say on the subject.

Council of Toulouse, 1590. Orders severe punishment and denunciation to the clergy for all "qui sortilegi fuerint, tam clerici quam laici," according to the canons (P. IV, c. 12, n. 2).—Hardouin, p. 1829.

Council of Avignon, 1594, although held on papal territory, has nothing.

All this would seem to indicate no great anxiety on the subject [of witchcraft].

Evidently throughout the sixteenth century the Gallican church took no special action against witchcraft, while incessantly denouncing the arts of the sorcerer and diviner. If there had been anything of the kind, Bochel could not have omitted it from his collection made in 1609 when the belief had made such progress.

Charles VIII, on October 9, 1490, decrees that all enchanters, diviners, invokers of evil spirits and practitioners of other evil arts are to be arrested. Those whose offences pertain to the Church are to be handed over to their Ordinaries. Their property to be sequestrated. Officials neglecting this duty to be deprived of their offices and heavily amerced.—Fontanon, Edicts et Ordonnances (Paris, 1611), IV, p. 237; Bochel, *op. cit.*, p. 118; see *Inquisition of the Middle Ages*, III, pp. 544–5.

The Cri du Prévot de Paris, July 20, 1493, "de par le Roi," announces to the kingdom severe and speedy justice to be executed on all "charmeurs, devineurs, invocateurs de mauvais et dampnés esprits, nigromancieurs et autres très-mauvaises et très-pernicieuses personnes usans de mauvais arts, sciences et sectes prohibées," and all consulting and

employing them.—Isambert, Recueil général des anciennes lois francaises, XI, pp. 252–8.

The chief interest in this is that apparently witchcraft was unknown at the time in France—or at least not accepted and acknowledged. Indeed this is indicated with great clearness in the rehabilitation by the Parlement of the Vaudois of Arras.

Story of the son of a Jew of Avignon who turned Christian and obtained papal appointment as vignier of Cavaillon, from which he rose to be president of a Parlement. Desiring to enlarge a small manor which he had inherited, he accused some rich peasants of *vaudoisie*, threw them in prison, and let them starve to death. Then in 1545 he condemned their heirs for contumacy and procured royal letters empowering him to summon all vassals to aid in executing the judgment. With these he raised a force which sacked and burnt several villages, driving the inhabitants to the mountains; he published a decree forbidding all aid or charity to be given to them and, when some of them who were starving petitioned him for permission to leave the country, he replied that he would send them all to hell to live with the devils.—Cimber et Danjou, Archives curieuses, 1re Série (Paris, 1836), III, pp. 412–14.

Shows how already the charge of witchcraft was a facile one with which to destroy those against whom it was brought.

January 18, 1573, the Parlement of Dole condemns Gilles Garnier to be dragged to the place of execution and there burnt alive. The sentence relates how by his own free confession (no mention of torture—H. C. L.) on the previous Michaelmas in a vineyard at Gorges in the shape of a wolf he killed with teeth and claws a girl ten or twelve years old and, after eating part of a thigh and arm, he carried the rest to his wife Apolline, in the hermitage of Saint-Bonnot near Amanges. Then on the eighth day after All-Saints he similarly killed another girl and would have eaten her had not the coming of three persons driven him off. Then on the fifteenth day after All-Saints he killed another, a boy, and ate part of him. Also on the Friday before St. Bartholomew, 1572, he killed another boy and would have eaten him had not some persons come to the rescue; he was then in man's shape.

A contemporary note says he was a hermit; then he took a wife and, having nothing to support her, he confessed that,

wandering through the woods in despair, a figure appeared to him, promising great things, among others that he could change himself into a wolf, a lion, or a leopard, when he chose the wolf as an animal better known, and effected the change by rubbing himself with an ointment.—Cimber et Danjou, Archives curieuses, VIII, p. 9.

[A résumé of beliefs current in France in the latter half of the sixteenth century is given in the following sentence pronounced against certain witches at Avignon.]

"Exemplar Sententiae contra Fascinarios latae Avenioni, anno Domini 1582.

"Considering the processes against N. N. N. etc., accused before us, in which, as well by the relations and confessions judicially made by you and each of you before us, repeated often under oath, as by the accusations and depositions of witnesses and other lawful proofs, from which acts and processes it has been and is lawfully established that you and each of you have renounced the one and triune God, the creator of us all, and have worshipped the merciless Devil, the old enemy of the human race, and have devoted yourselves to him forever and have renounced before the said cacodemon your most sacred baptism and your god-parents in it and your share of paradise and the eternal inheritance which our Lord Jesus Christ by his death acquired for you and for the whole human race, that roaring Devil himself pouring the water which you accepted; changing the true name received in the baptismal font, you have allowed a false one to be imposed on you in that fictitious baptism; in pledge of the faith professed in the demon you have given him a fragment of your garments; and in order that your name should be removed and obliterated from the Book of Life, by command of the Father of Lies, with your own hand you have placed your sign in the black book of perpetual death and of the reproved and damned; and, in order that he might bind you more firmly to such great infidelity and impiety, he branded each of you with his mark or stigma, as being his own property; and upon a circle, which is the symbol of divinity, traced upon the earth, which is the footstool of God, you and each of you have bound yourselves by oath to obey his orders and commands, trampling upon the cross and the sign of the Lord; and in obedience to him, mounted on a staff and with your thighs anointed with a certain most execrable unguent

prescribed to you by the said Devil, you have been carried through the air by the said tempter, in an unseasonable hour of the night fitting for malefactors, to the appointed spot on certain days, and there, in the synagogue common to other witches, sorcerers, heretical enchanters and worshippers of demons, by the light of a noisome fire, after many jubilations, dancings, feastings, drinkings and games in honor of the presiding Beelzebub, prince of demons, in the form and appearance of a most black and filthy goat, you have adored him as God, by acts and words, approaching him suppliantly on your knees, offering him lighted candles of pitch, kissing with the utmost reverence and a sacrilegious mouth his most stinking and nasty anus, invoking him by the name of the true God, asking his aid to punish all your enemies and those who refuse you anything, and, taught by him, inflicting revenge, injuries and enchantments on men and beasts; with the aid of Satan you have thus committed many homicides of children, have deprived mothers of milk, have caused wasting sickness and other most severe disease and, with the knowledge and assent of many, you have exhumed children, killed by your malefic art and buried in the church-yards, and have taken them to the above described synagogue of your accomplice witches, offering them to the demon presiding on his throne, where, after keeping the fat and cutting off the head, the hands and the feet, you have cooked the trunk and by command of your said *fattur* you have damnably devoured them; then, adding evil to evil, you men have fornicated with succubi, you women with incubi, committing the execrable crime of sodomy with them in spite of their freezing coldness. And what is the most detestable of all, when you receive the most august sacrament of the Eucharist in the church, by instruction of the said serpent ejected from paradise, you have retained it in your mouths and nefariously spit it out on the ground so as to insult our true and holy God with the greatest show of contempt, contumely and impiety, thus promoting the glory, honor, triumph and kingdom of the Devil, whom you have adorned with all honor, praise, dignity, authority and adoration, all of which most grievous, horrid and abominable acts are directly insulting and contumelious to the omnipotent God, the Creator of all things. Wherefore we, Friar Florus, Provincial of the Order of Preaching Friars, Doctor of Holy Theology and Inquisitor-general of the Holy Faith in all this Legation of Avignon,

having the fear of God before our eyes, sitting as a tribunal, by this our definitive sentence, which, by the custom of our predecessors, we render in writing with the advice of theologians and jurists; piously invoking the names of our Lord Jesus Christ and the Blessed Virgin Mary, we declare and pronounce and definitively sentence all you the above-named and each one of you to have been and to be true apostates, idolators, rebels to the most holy faith, deniers and contemners of Omnipotent God, sodomites guilty of the unspeakable crime, adulterers, fornicators, sorcerers, witches, sacrilegious heretics, enchanters, homicides, infanticides, worshippers of demons, assertors of the satanic, diabolic and infernal science and of the damnable and condemned faith, blasphemers, perjurers, infamous, and to have been convicted of all evil witchcraft and crimes. Therefore we remit you all and each one of you, really and effectively, by this our sentence, to the secular court, to be punished by its judgment with condign and lawful penalties."—Michaelis, Pneumalogie ou Discours des Esprits, fol. 73–5.

Observe, no plea for mercy—they are handed over to the executioner. As their confessions are alluded to, they must have confessed and begged absolution, which in ordinary inquisitorial practice relieved from death.

Pigray, surgeon to Henry III, relates (Chirurgie, liv. vii, c. 10) that when the Parlement of Paris took refuge in Tours (qy. in 1588?) it appointed him and the royal physicians Falaiseau and Renard to examine fourteen men and women who had appealed from sentence of death for sorcery. The examination was made in presence of two counsellors of the parlement. "We saw the reports on which the sentence had been rendered and could find nothing of what was there stated —among other things that they had insensible spots. We examined them diligently, omitting nothing of what is required, stripping them naked and pricking them in many places, which we found extremely sensitive. We interrogated them on many points, as in cases of melancholia, and found nothing but that they were poor stupid people, some careless of death and others desirous to die. Our advice was to purge them with hellebore rather than to punish them, and the Parlement discharged them as we recommended."—Quoted by Bayle, Reponse aux Questions d'un Provincial, c. 39 (in Meinders' Gedancken und Monita, p. 67).

A violent tract of the Ligue, in 1589, accuses Henry III of

sorcery and of favoring sorcerers. It says that in 1586 and 1587, when a number had been condemned to death by the local judges and had appealed to the *cours souverains*, he caused them to be acquitted and the magistrates or accusers to be condemned to costs and damages. Also after his flight from Paris there were found at Vincennes various articles showing practices of sorcery and explaining his visits there.—Cimber et Danjou, *op. cit.*, XII, p. 491.

Lancre, Pierre de.—*Tableau de l'Inconstance des mauvais Anges.* Paris, 1613.

De Lancre was "Conseiller du Roy au Parlement de Bordeaux."

After the holocaust in the Landes in 1609, de Lancre in the work reciting his experiences addresses a preliminary Epistle to Chancellor Sillery in which he says that he had hoped sorcery was suppressed in Guyenne, but matters within a few days brought before the Parlement of Guyenne leads him to think that sorcery is only just beginning. In a single small parish near Acqs more than forty persons have been afflicted with epilepsy through sorcery and an infinite number of others have a disease which makes them bark like dogs. Moreover the sorcerers have made the dogs mad, so that they attack their masters' families; others bewitch husbands and wives, so that they violate the latter in the presence of the former, both being made incapable of crying out or resisting. Formerly the only sorcerers known were vulgar, ignorant peasants of the Landes, but now those who confess depose that they see (in the Sabbat) an infinite number of persons of quality. It has been clearly recognized that it is as difficult to exterminate the sorcerers of our frontier of Labourt and of certain other places of Guyenne as to measure the air and wind which transport them to the Sabbat or to make fly the mountains which they inhabit. Nor will preaching succeed better, for they are deaf to it. But it is necessary to strive while yet there are persons who resist the temptations of Satan. Apparently he looks forward to a general conversion of the population to witchcraft. He has just heard that the queen-regent has adopted the holy resolution of sending selected preachers to instruct the people and attract them from this abomination, whereat he rejoices.

The Landes lie north of the River Adour. Dax is on the southern bank of the Adour. Le Labourt is the extreme southwestern part of Guienne, along the Bidassoa, and is a Basque district.

De Lancre's colleague in the commission, President d'Espaignet of the Parlement, addresses him a long Latin ode, in which he describes the

—"datis
Partim fugae, partim rogo
Sagis—"

and his emotions at having recalled to him the experiences through which he passed in the business and the horrors of the Sabbat to which he listened.

Then follows an Advertissement which states that, in view of the complaints of sorcery in the Pays de Labourt, the king, in May, 1609, commissioned President d'Espaignet and de Lancre to go there and judge without appeal. They were only four months at the work, for d'Espaignet had to go to the Chambre at Nerac. They found many new and incredible things—that the devil held his assemblies at the gates of Bordeaux and in the square of the Palais Gallienne. The devil opposed the commission from the start, giving the people false impressions as to its power, preventing the accused from confessing and telling them that he had more power to burn the commissioners than they had to burn the guilty. They would go to sleep under torture, were rendered speechless when they wished to confess, but it was all in vain and, when some were burnt, he was reproached in the Sabbat for failing to keep his promises to protect them. He met this by producing phantoms to represent the dead, who assured the complainants that they were alive and happy in a safe place. But the commissioners pursued their work so vigorously that Satan was ashamed to show himself in three or four Sabbats, subrogating a little demon of no authority, who explained his absence by saying that he was pleading against God and had overcome him, for which he demanded six-score children as a recompense. (Later on, pp. 66–7, he tells this story somewhat differently. Satan reported on his return, July 22, 1609, that he had been pleading the case of his followers against Christ and had won the victory, so they need have no more fear, and for this he demanded 80 children.)

He gives as a reason for his book: "On levera l'erreur de plusieurs qui nient les principes du sortilege, croyans que ce n'est que prestige, songe et illusion: et ferons voir clairement que le doubte et l'impunité ou douceur que nos peres et les Cours de Parlements y ont apporté jusqu'icy, ont nourry et maintenu la fausse croyance et engendré la multiplicité."

Also, as the crimes are now proved, the mildness used by the Parlements hitherto must be abandoned, and even the most stupid and incredulous can no longer doubt the existence of sorcery and that the devil transports the sorcerers corporally to the Sabbat.

He speaks of the evidence gained from 60 or 80 "insignes sorciers" and 500 witnesses bearing the stigmata of the devil (which would appear to cast in doubt the 600 victims said to have been burnt by the commissioners—H. C. L.).

He speaks of five priests against whom there were at least ten witnesses who bore testimony of seeing them at the Sabbat counterfeiting the mass, dancing, feasting and participating in all the other disorders. Apparently they escaped punishment, for he says, "je les voy indignement vaguer par le monde," but he does not name them, in order to avoid scandal.

Thus far the preliminary matter, which is unpaged.

The Pays de Labourt is a hive of sorcerers; in no place in Europe is there approach to the infinite number that are found there (p. 28).

He ascribes this to the poverty and misery of the people, especially of the women, giving Satan ample opportunity of perverting them. Besides, the priests of most of the parishes have been established there by Satan (pp. 36–7). The curés are "supposts de Satan infectés de cette ordure" (p. 38).

"La plus grande partie des Prestres sont Sorciers" (p. 56).

There are 30,000 souls in the Pays de Labourt and among them are very few families untouched by sorcery, so that some heads of families, officials and people of quality preferred the discomfort caused by the sorcerers to seeing such a mass of gibbets and stakes at which their kindred were burnt. "On our coming they fled by caravans, some putting to sea and others flying to Spain under pretence of pilgrimages to Monserrat, St. Iago and other shrines" (p. 38).

There are Sabbats almost every night and sometimes even in mid-day (p. 62).

In some great Sabbats held at Hendaye there were more than 12,000 persons present (p. 64). They call the Sabbat "Aquelarre" (p. 65).

In the parish of Sainct-Pé it is sometimes held in private houses. While we were there one was held in the hotel where we were staying (p. 65).

It shows how powerful was the pre-occupation and how blinded were the witch-finders that these experienced lawyers, trained to consider the weight of testimony, contentedly ascribe the variations in the description of the ceremonies of the Sabbat to the pleasure which the devil finds in diversifying the proceedings. To a mind not wholly prejudiced in advance the extracts which he gives from the depositions would have led to the conclusion that the culprits were seeking merely to invent stories that would satisfy their judges. See p. 73.

"Whether the Sabbat is an illusion or a reality is a question so debated by ancient and modern doctors and by the judges of the Cours de Parlement that it seems to me that one cannot now doubt it. . . . Father Del Rio has treated it as a matter of conscience and has taught us what it is that the Church believes about it and consequently what all good Christians should believe about a matter which has always until now seemed uncertain and doubtful" (p. 75).

Del Rio, Disquis. Mag., lib. ii, q. 16, after discussing the illusion theory says, "Secunda ergo opinio est, quam verissimam judico," etc.

"It is through this difference of opinion that our fathers lived in this error, that witches should not be condemned to death, but simply be confided to their pastors and curés as if it were only illusion and false imagination" (p. 77).

He says of Del Rio "Car ses raisons sont si fortes, que la creance de l'Eglise estant universelle, on ne peut meshuy estre d'autre advis" (p. 78).

Goes on to discuss the Cap. Episcopi (p. 78).

He admits that the Sabbat is sometimes the illusion of ecstasy and suggests that the devil may cause this three or four times to seduce the novice into going corporeally (p. 84).

It seems that in the Sabbats of Labourt there were collections made of real money given by those present. A certain Detsail was collector; he was assumed to use the money for the defence of the sorcerers, but he was accused of keeping it—and in fact he was one of the richest men of his parish (p. 86).

There was also a fine for non-attendance, sometimes of $\frac{1}{5}$ of a crown and sometimes of 10 sols, and for these fines there were collectors (p. 87).

The presiding demon was known as Lou Peccat (p. 88).

He interjects a statement from the cases of some witches of the parish of Amou on trial at Bordeaux in 1613 (p. 89).

Says that the *sorcières insignes* rarely weep. Under torture they rather laugh than cry (p. 88).

They are often transported to Newfoundland to hold the Sabbat (p. 91).

Two thousand children of Labourt were presented to the devil by certain women, who have mostly been executed and the rest will shortly be. The children were all made to renounce Christ and bore the mark of the devil (p. 92).

There seems to be a distinction between witnesses and accused—probably the former were promised exemption in return for evidence.

A girl of seventeen, named Marie Dindarte, said that, when she anointed herself, she flew through the air. She was asked to fly and said she would do so if she had the ointment. Told, if she went to the Sabbat the next night, to bring some. She went the next night and reported that the devil would give her none because she had revealed things. She also said that the devil had the night before opened a window in a chamber below the apartments of the commissioners and carried to the Sabbat sixteen witnesses who had slept there as a place of safety, and this was confirmed by the witnesses (p. 93).

Qy. Why should he have brought them back to continue their evidence?

Even the prisoners were regularly transported to the Sabbat. A preliminary sleep, however, is necessary—so those who do not want to go stay awake; but it suffices merely to close the eyes and one is transported in a moment (p. 94).

He admits that sometimes it is dream and illusion. But sometimes they go corporeally while they seem to remain before our eyes, the devil supplying a phantom in their place. He can carry them off from prison, even though they are chained, but he is forced to return them—he does this to keep them comforted and true to him (p. 96). This carrying off from prison is a common occurrence (pp. 108–9).

As a final and conclusive argument he says that the Catholic Church, which cannot err, punishes witches with death, and it would err criminally if it thus punished illusions and dreams, and from this the inference is that those who believe the Sabbat to be only an illusion sin against the Church. And the Parlements, which have more experience than at the time of the Can. Episcopi, make no difficulty about it (p. 99).

In 1609 the Parlement of Bordeaux condemned to death a young man, a Protestant of Nerac, on his simple confession,

without witnesses, that the devil had taken him to the roof of a house and down the chimney, where he poisoned a young child, returning by the same route, and then being transported to the Sabbat in the place of the Palace Gallienne (p. 100).

And in this year 1609 the Parlement of Bordeaux has condemned to death an infinite number of others (p. 100).

Sorcery was no novelty in the Pays de Labourt. In 1576, Boniface de Lasse, the Lieutenant de Labourt, condemned to death more than forty witches and executed them, without allowing an appeal, which was customary in capital sentences—and for this he never was reproved (pp. 101–3).

The Commission had six priests in prison together (p. 108).

De Lancre had discussed in Naples with Giambattista della Porta the composition of the unguent used by witches (p. 111).

The Parlement of Bordeaux must have busied itself with the witches of Labourt prior to the Commission, for there is an allusion to Saubadine de Subiette, a witch who had died there in prison (p. 112).

He affirms that in Labourt there are more than 2000 children who are carried to the Sabbat almost every night (p. 114).

He speaks of the Sabbat as a gathering of 100,000—some phantoms and illusions, but the most part living men and women (p. 119).

Quotes from the confession of Estebene de Cambrue, a witch tried in 1567 (p. 123).

In explaining the recantation of confessions at executions, he describes how, when the fishermen came home from Newfoundland to the number of 5000 or 6000 and found what was on foot, it was impossible to keep order at the executions; they surged around the condemned, demanding their retraction of their testimony against their mothers, wives and sisters, sometimes holding daggers at their throats. The officials were powerless and it was difficult to make them perform their duties in the face of these howling mobs (p. 111).

When the Commission was ended, it left a world of witches in Labourt and the neighboring districts, without being able to judge them. The Palais and the Cour de Parlement de Bordeaux had been filled with them; the Conciergerie de la Cour could not hold them and it was necessary to confine them in one of the châteaux of the town, named the Château du Ha (p. 144).

Long story of Isaac de Queyran, of Nerac, executed by the Parlement of Bordeaux in 1609 (pp. 146–152).

This story of a valet and stable hand poisoning the eldest son of his employer, by command of the devil—all of which he freely confessed—suggests the terror in which everyone lived, surrounded by witches and liable at any moment to suffer. It explains and justifies the horror felt for witches and the atrocities employed for their extermination. It is the same with the multitudinous details recorded by de Lancre from his judicial labors. The world was full of them and no one knew whether his family and friends or any one whom he might meet was not a sorcerer gifted with the awful powers granted by the demon. That the terror was fantastic and imaginary did not render it less real and it accounts for the craze which devastated Europe during the seventeenth century.

Francillon and Catherine de la Garde and other witches of Amou were still in prison in 1613 (p. 171).

He devotes a long chapter to investigating why, if the crow of a cock is heard, the whole Sabbat disappears and the participants are obliged to find their way back to their homes as best they can. He exhausts all classical learning to explain this and concludes that the cock is a mysterious bird of which God seems to avail himself to recall his people to his service. Witches seek to prevent his crowing by rubbing his head and breast with olive oil (pp. 154–73).

In Labourt there are more than 3000 witches of both sexes who bear the mark of the devil. This mark is so sure an indication that, supported by others, it suffices for condemnation (p. 185).

Francine Broqueiron of Amou is on trial at Bordeaux, February 8, 1613 (pp. 187–8).

Pricking for the witch-mark seems to be thoroughly established, though de Lancre, who had ample experience, regards it as uncertain and as cruel when practised as it frequently was (pp. 188–91). The devil often removes it—or does not impress it. When found, it is a violent presumption (p. 192).

So great was the fear of witches in Labourt that the churches at night would be filled with children brought there by their mothers to keep them from being carried off to the Sabbat (p. 193).

A very curious case of Jean Grenier, a boy of thirteen or fourteen, who freely confesses that some three years before a dark gentleman in a forest had given him a wolf-skin; on putting it on he became a wolf, and on removing it he returned to human shape. He had killed and eaten several dogs and children. The cause of his arrest was his attacking a girl

who beat him off with a stick. On investigation the cases of the children killed were confirmed in their details. The Parlement of Bordeaux renders a long *arrêt* (de Lancre, pp. 262–305) in which it exhausts the subject in all its ramifications from ancient times to the present. It takes a very sensible view, while accepting it all as a fact—"la Cour en fin a eu esgard à l'aage et imbecillité de cet enfant, qui est si stupide et idiot que les enfans de sept à huict ans temoignent ordinairement plus de jugement, mal nourry en toutes sortes et si petit que sa stature n'arrivant à son aage on ne le jugeroit de dix ans. . . . Voicy un jeune garçon abandonné et chassé par son pere, qui a une marastre pour mere, vaguant par les champs, sans guide et sans personne du monde qui en ait du soing, mendiant son pain, qui n'a nulle instruction de la crainte de Dieu, à qui la mauvaise seduction, les necessitez et le desespoir ont corrompu le naturel, dont le maling Esprit a faict sa proye" (pp. 301–2).

Consequently he is condemned to confinement for life in a convent, under pain of hanging for leaving it (p. 305).

Better than burning.

In 1610 de Lancre went to the convent of the Cordeliers and examined Grenier, then a man of twenty-one or twenty-two. He was still somewhat dull and stupid, slow in what he did; he made no secret of having been a *loup-garou* and talked openly of what he had done; he admitted a desire to eat children, especially young girls, who were more tender, and would do so if it were not forbidden. Also he took great pleasure in looking at wolves (pp. 309–17). He died as a good Christian, early in November, 1610 (p. 325).

So the merciful judgment of the Parlement saved soul as well as body.

The essence of the inquisitorial process is conveyed in de Lancre's candid remark, "Car les interrogatoires qu'on faict à un accusé sont autant de pièges pour le faire tomber en confession" (p. 410).

In discussing the question of priestly interpreters for the Basque sorcerers he alludes to interpreters being also necessary for those of lower Britanny, showing that there were contemporaneous prosecutions there (p. 414).

The rapidity of action of the Commission in its press of business is exemplified in a passing allusion to the torture of several sorcerers on a single morning, which seems to have been not infrequent (p. 415).

Speaks of eight or ten priests under trial (p. 415).

It was only in two or three cases that torture was used in defect of proof—there was always enough of this. Therefore it was to discover accomplices (p. 416).

Speaks of Catherine de Barrendeguy, an *insigne sorcière* tried in Bordeaux, September, 1610, showing that trials were already on foot there (p. 416).

The priests and curés of Labourt and of the neighboring districts of Navarre are for the most part sorcerers. They are so respected that no one is scandalized by their habits, frequenting the taverns, the dances, the ball games, with swords by their side and half-pikes in their hands, or going on pilgrimages in company with three or four pretty girls. Their privileges are such that at first no one dared to accuse them, but Satan could not at last prevent an old priest of good family from being denounced. He confessed that some fifteen or sixteen years before he had wanted to quit this abomination, but the devil so tormented him that he was almost out of his senses, and his kindred sought to defend him as irresponsible. He confessed freely and there was abundant testimony. He was condemned to death and, as the Bishop of Bayonne was in Bordeaux, he requested the Bishop of Dax to perform the degradation, after which he was duly executed (pp. 415–6).

No respect for spiritual jurisdiction.

This made a great sensation and there was no longer hesitation in accusing priests. Some of them feigned vows to Monserrat and other places and fled; others took to the sea. At first we looked on the accusations with suspicion as the result of enmities, but little innocent children and persons from other parishes bore testimony to seeing them in the Sabbat. We arrested seven of the most notable in the land, most of them having cure of souls in the best parishes of Labourt. One of them, Pierre Bocal of Siboro, aged twenty-seven, had celebrated the devil's mass in the Sabbat the night before he sang his first one in his church; on being asked why he did so, he replied that it was to practice it properly. For the service in the Sabbat the devil gave him 200 crowns, while that in his church brought him only about 100. He and another priest of Siboro named Migalena were condemned. The Bishop of Bayonne degraded them and they were executed. Migalena would not confess sacramentally

and could not pray, but repeated confusedly the Pater-noster, Ave Maria and Confiteor (pp. 427–30).

Long argument (pp. 430–52) to prove that the secular justice has cognizance in such cases of priests, and two cases which he quotes of other offences decided to be *cas royaux* justify him. In France by this time evidently the benefit of clergy was much restricted and, as he points out, the crimes ascribed to witchcraft—worshipping Satan, profaning the sacraments, murdering children and devastating the harvests —are much more serious than others which subject priests to the royal jurisdiction.

The other five priests saved themselves by recusations and appeals delaying matters over the term of the Commission, which expired November 1, d'Espaignet going to Nerac and de Lancre to Bordeaux. They were left in prison. Two of them escaped, one to Spain, the other kept in hiding for a short time and then showed himself openly, "tant la licence des Prestres en ce païs là est grande," until the Bishop of Bayonne had him arrested. What was the end is not stated (pp. 452–7).

In this account there escapes him a significant admission. He speaks of witchcraft as "un forfaict, la preuve duquel, pour claire et evidente qu'elle fut, tenoit tousjours en quelque doubte les plus clair-voyans" (p. 454). Again "tient encore la pluspart des juges et quasi tout le monde en quelque incertitude" (p. 467).

Allusion to trial by Parlement of Bordeaux, in 1611, of an *insigne sorcière*, named Bertomine de Gert (p. 460).

Showing it constantly at work.

There were also three priests of St. Jean de Luz on trial by the Parlement in January, 1611 (p. 465).

He devotes a long discourse to the question whether sorcery is a *cas privilégié* depriving a priest of spiritual jurisdiction,[1] although it concerns a matter of faith. He says this has never been formally decided by any Parlement (pp. 466–523).

The cases of Gauffredy, Urbain Grandier and Boullé show that no doubt was entertained as to the competence of the secular jurisdiction.

The retention of the Cap. Episcopi in the Decretum under the revision by order of Gregory XIII annulled the argument of Pico della Mirandola and Bodin that it was of no author-

[1] *i. e.*, benefit of clergy.

ity, and to it de Lancre attributes the variation of the Parlements as to capital punishment for witches. He argues the matter and accepts the opinion of Del Rio that there are two kinds of witches—one who go really to the Sabbat and the other to whom it is an illusion. The latter, he says, may be sent to their pastors for reconciliation to the church. The former are apostates who have renounced God and adopted Satan as their god. The latter have no power of divination or of working evil. But the assertion of a witch that she has been deluded is no more to be accepted than if a traitor says his treason was illusory; she can be tortured and, if a full confession is confirmed by other proof, she must be condemned to death (pp. 525–536).

As for the suggestion that phantoms of the innocent may appear at the Sabbat, he satisfies himself with the assertion of Del Rio that God has never permitted this, or, if he has sometimes permitted that the innocent should thus be defamed, he has never permitted them to be condemned (p. 536).

But Catherine de Barrendeguy, under torture and at her execution, September 3, 1610, asserted that when witches desired to injure anyone, at their request the devil would cause his apparition to appear in the Sabbat, but these phantoms were motionless and took no part in the proceedings (p. 537).

Participation in the Sabbat is sufficient, without injuries to others being proved or confessed (p. 538). Such things are much less than the injuries to God in the rites of the Sabbat (p. 542).

There is no prescription of time for sorcery (p. 544).

The evidence is receivable of a child of six, seven or eight years old (p. 546).

In an infinity of cases the witch at execution revokes her confession, which makes some judges doubt. This is of no moment, as it is only a last effort of Satan to save his follower (p. 549).

In Labourt the executions were so difficult, owing to the great number of witches, that sometimes we were delayed a month in constraining the sergeant and trumpeter to act, for they were so threatened, and were afraid for their lives (p. 549).

He quotes an Ordonnance of Charles IX (1560–74) to the effect that, where there has been only presence at the Sabbat

and no *malefice* to individuals, witches are sometimes to be punished by fire and sometimes otherwise (p. 552–3).

I cannot identify this in Isambert.

It is argued that repentant witches should be pardoned. This is true if the repentance is spontaneous, before arrest, by sacramental confession and penance, with abjuration—but repentance constrained by prosecution is not to be trusted (p. 554).

The Commission put to death a woman of twenty-two simply because she had gone with another to the Sabbat to learn its ways (p. 557).

In 1577 the Parlement of Toulouse put to death more witches than it did for all other crimes together during two years (p. 558).

Grégoire (Syntag. jur. univ., lib. xxxiv, c. 21, n. 10) says it put to death, by fire or hanging, more than 400. See Beaune, Les Sorciers de Lyon (Dijon, 1868), p. 6.

In the press of cases which came before the Parlement of Bordeaux after the Commission it was decided in 1610 that simply going to the Sabbat, without proof of *malefices*, entailed the death penalty (pp. 558–9).

Speaks of witchcraft having spread from Labourt throughout the Landes of Bordeaux (pp. 562–3).

There seems at this time to have been a recrudescence of persecution, as shown by De L'Ancre, Gauffredi, etc.

François Perreaud relates that in 1612 the prisons of Macon were filled with a number of men and women of the village of Chasselas accused of witchcraft. They were condemned, but appealed to the Parlement of Paris, "du ressort duquel est le Bailliage de Mascons," which acquitted them all—"ils furent renvoyés absous à pur et à plein."—Perreaud, L'Antidemon de Mascon (Genève, 1653), p. 53.

Perreaud in 1612 was Calvinist minister of Mâcon.

The Chambre de la Tournelle (Parl. of Paris) in 1616 condemned three laborers of Berry to strangulation and burning for having been at the Sabbat.—Beaune, Les Sorciers de Lyon (Dijon, 1868), p. 8.

At Limoges, in 1630, three aged peasants, Galleton, Jasson and Pautier, are strangled and burnt. A servant girl aged

eighteen has nervous attacks and says she sees them accompanied with demons. On their arrest, complaints pour in until there are 45 accusing witnesses. All three deny. Under torture, Galleton and Jasson confess to the Sabbat and other crimes. Pautier endures the severest torture without confession, either then or when executed, and his demon is seen near his left ear in the form of a large fly, while the servant girl who was present sees his soul carried off by six demons. The writer of the account tells us that this affair proves the truth of the views of Bodin, Del Rio and Remy and disproves the Cap. Episcopi alleged by some theologians. He also alludes to some recent executions of witches at Bazas, where there are a number of prisoners accused.—Recit veritable . . . de trois Sorciers deffaits en la ville de Lymoges (Reprint, Lyon, 1875).

La Menardaye, Jean Baptiste, Père de.—*Examen et Discussion critique de l'Histoire des Diables de Loudun.* Paris, 1747.

To the accusation that a special commission was formed to condemn Grandier,[1] the author tells us "qu'il ne sied jamais à d'honnêtes gens de blâmer leurs Supérieurs. Plus ils sont élevés au dessus de nous, moins il nous convient d'en juger. Tout nous l'interdit: la prudence, la religion, l'amour de la patrie et du bien public."—La Menardaye, p. 62.

He accuses Aubin[2] of audacity in asserting that the accusations of the demoniacs were not legitimate evidence (p. 66).

Apparently he says nothing about the decision of the Sorbonne. As he does not deny it, we may accept it.

He assumes that the possession and the revelations were genuine (pp. 67–74).

But the argument to which he refers repeatedly is that Grandier deserved death for his immoralities, implying that the accusation of sorcery and the revelations of the nuns were superfluous, as on p. 268. Yet he goes on to prove at length the reality of sorcery and of pact with the demon and that the sorcerer is the most dangerous enemy of society (pp. 87, sqq.). Sorcery, he says, is evident throughout all the dissimulations and artifices of the writer [*i. e.*, Aubin] (p. 299).

"Il est absolument faux qu'il y ait jamais eu, sur la matière

[1] Executed for witchcraft in 1634.
[2] Author of *Histoire des Diables de Loudun.* Amsterdam, 1693.

de la Magie, aucune sentence abusive, tant que les juges ont suivi exactement les régles; et on n'en trouve point d'exemple" (p. 94).

"Il n'y auroit point d'abus aussi dangéreux que de laisser subsister l'engeance pernicieuse des Magiciens" (p. 95).

Those who deny their existence desire to destroy Christianity (p. 114).

Belief in magic and possession is essential to the faith of the Church (p. 117).

His credulity is omnivorous. In proof of the existence of sorcery and possession he cites the case of the shepherds of Brie and of Nicole Aubry in 1566 (pp. 120–38).

A still more extraordinary story of Marie Elizabeth de Ranfain, possessed by a demon sent by a physician named Poirot, who was burnt for it, April 7, 1622 (pp. 161–72).

He seriously argues that, in the Grandier matter, the cases in which the possessions were shown to be frauds in reality only confirmed their truth, as showing the astuteness of the demons (pp. 220–31, 237).

He admits that the PP. Surin, Lactance and Tranquille were possessed by the demon, who killed the two latter, and attributes it to the wisdom of God, who desired to put a final seal on the truth of the possession of the nuns and furnish a snare to the malignity of the Protestants (pp. 256–7).

He also regards the affair of Louviers as genuine sorcery (pp. 272–4).

The reason he gives for Grandier's sending demons to the nuns is that, when their confessor Moussaut died, he aspired to the succession, but Canon Mignon was appointed. Filled with anger he resolved to give Mignon a heavy burden and bewitched the women (pp. 447–8).

A priest named Bertrand Guillaudot is burnt alive at Dijon in 1743 for sorceries connected with treasure-trove. His confession leads to the arraignment of twenty-nine others at Lyons. After a long trial five of them are condemned to death in February, 1745—among them three priests whose service consisted in the celebration of the sacrilegious masses which were an essential part of the rites for the discovery of treasure—and one of these, Louis Debaraz, was burnt alive. Five were condemned to the galleys, three to exile and four to fines.—Beaune, Les Sorciers de Lyon, pp. 30–67.

VI. England.

One reason why witchcraft assumed larger proportions in Great Britain after the Reformation than the comparatively mild prosecutions previous was "the fact that exorcism, the magical or miraculous ejection of devils by certain consecrated forms of adjuration, remained the only generally recognized supernatural privilege allowed to their clergy, and so acquired a proportionate value."—Art. in *Westminster Review*, January, 1871, p. 19.

The Act of 33 Hen. VIII, c. 8 (1541). "It shall be Felony to practice or cause to be practiced Conjuration, Enchantment, Witchcraft or Sorcery, to get money or to consume any person in his body, members or goods, or to provoke any person to unlawful love," etc.—Statutes at Large, II, p. 307.

This Act repealed (1547) by 1 Edw. VI, c. 12.—Ib., p. 393.

This apparently left the crime unpunished except by the Common Law until 1562. The Statutes have no reference to any earlier legislation.

5 Eliz., c. 16 (1562), was an act providing the several penalties of Conjuration or Invocation of wicked spirits, and Witchcraft, Enchantment, Charm or Sorcery.—Ib., II, p. 559.

This act repealed by 1 Jac. I, c. 12.

Prior to 1541 witchcraft was probably left to the ecclesiastical courts and ecclesiastical law. There seems to be no special reference to it by Bracton in his lib. iii, tract. 2, which treats of criminal jurisprudence.

Hale (Placit. Coronae I, p. 429) says that working on the fancy of another so as to put him in a passion of grief or fear is not murder in the eyes of men "because no external act of violence was offered whereof the common law can take notice, and secret things belong to God; and hence it was that before the Statute of 1 Jac. I, c. 12, witchcraft or fascination was not felony because it wanted a trial, tho' some constitutions of the civil law make it penal."

He evidently lost sight of 33 Hen. viii, c. 8, and 5 Eliz., c. 16.

In another place he says, however, "Witchcraft, Sortilegium, was by the antient laws of England of ecclesiastical cognizance, and upon conviction thereof, without abjuration, was punishable with death by writ 'de haeretico comburendo,' v. Co. P. C. cap. 6. Extr. de Haeret., c. 8, §5, no. 6."—Ib., p. 383.

The "celebrated witch-act" of 1604 (1 Jac. I, c. 12): "An Act against conjuration, witchcraft and dealing with evil and

wicked spirits. Penalty for practicing of invocation or conjuration—Conjuration or Invocation whereby any person is killed or lamed—Declaring by witchcraft where anything is hidden—Procuring of unlawful love—Second offense felony—No forfeiture of dower or inheritance—Trial of a Peer of the Realm." (Only the above synopsis given.)—Statutes at Large, III, p. 9.

This act not repealed until 9 Geo. II, c. 5.

A curious report of a trial, July 26, 1566, of Agnes Waterhouse, who confessed to having been a witch for fifteen years. The jury convicted her. At her execution, July 29, she said she had sent her cat "Sathan" to kill a tailor named Wardal several times, but the cat reported that Wardal was so strong in the faith that he could not kill him. And finally "she yielded up her sowle trusting to be in joye with Christe her Sauiour, which dearly had bought her with his most precious bloudde."—The Examination and Confession of Certain Witches at Chelmsford, London, 1566. (Reprint by Dr. Hermann Beigel.)

Scot, Reginald.—*The Discovery of Witchcraft.* London, 1665. (First ed., 1584.)

[Mr. Lea had not yet culled Scot's book. Only the following bits are found.]

Reginald Scot alludes to the execution about 1580 of seventeen or eighteen witches at St. Osith's, Essex—a small parish. He trusts "that by this time there remain not many in that parish." He quotes Brian Darcie[1] for details and refuses "to fill my Book with such beastly stuffe" [as Richard Gallis of Windsor uses].—A Discourse concerning the Nature and Substance of Devils and Spirits, bk. i, c. 33 (ed. London, 1665, p. 29. Appended to his Discovery of Witchcraft).

Scot mentions flying in the air, sabbats, etc., as ascribed to witches, but his book is a learned one and for the beliefs on the subject he refers to Mall. Malef., Nider, Cumanus, Bart. de Spina, etc.—Discovery of Witchcraft, bk. i, c. 4; bk. iii, cc. 3, 13.

Scot alludes to "a foolish pamphlet dedicated to the Lord Darcy by W. W., 1582," urging the use of torture and blaming the judges for only hanging witches, when they deserve a hundred times greater punishment than murderers and thieves.

[1] Mr Lea clearly assumes that Darcie was himself the "W. W." who wrote the account.

"But if you will see more folly and lewdness comprised in one lewd book, I commend you to Ri. Ga.,[1] a Windsor-man who, being a madman, has written according to his frantick humour."—Ib., i, c. 8.

In arguing that the Sabbat is illusory, Scot makes no reference to any English authority or English examples.—Ib., x, c. 9.

In fact, the very cursory attention paid to the Sabbat, which looms so large in the Continental writers, shows how little was thought of it in England at the time—and compares strikingly with the details in which Scot indulges with regard to incubi and succubi.

Gifford,[2] George.—*A Discourse of the Subtill Practices of Devilles by Witches and Sorcerers.* London, 1587.

Gifford, "Minister of God's Word in Maldon," printed this little book in which he sought to combat two opposite errors —"some believing that Witches could do great Wonders, ascribing such power until Devils as belongeth only to God . . . others that all Witchcraft spoken of, even in the Holy Scriptures, is no more but either mere Cosenage or poisoning" (ch. 1). While therefore he strictly accepts all that he finds in Scripture, he cannot find there the modern superstitions concerning witches. Consequently, "Though at some times the conjectures fall out right, yet many times there is innocent blood shed, which is grievous sin. . . . The Jury commit perjury and cruel murder, which upon blind surmises of ignorant persons do give their verdict" (ch. 9). This is what the devil seeks to bring about by creating a false belief in his power to work evil through witches.

I have no copy of this rare book, but only a condensed abstract of it with extracts in MS. at the end of my copy of his second work—the following, which he published in 1593 and reprinted in 1603.

Gifford, Geo.—*A Dialogue concerning Witches and Witchcrafts, in which is layed open how craftily the Divell deceiveth not onely the Witches, but many other, and so leadeth them awrie into manie great errours.* London, 1603. (First ed., 1593. This has been reprinted by the Percy Society, London, 1842.)

Gifford's theory is expressed in his Epistle Dedicatory to Robert Clarke, one of the Barons of the Exchequer—"All the Divels in hell are so chained up and brideled by this high providence that they cannot plucke the wing from one poore little Wrenn without speciall leave given them from the ruler

[1] Richard Gallis. [2] The author's name was also spelled Giffard and Gyfford.

of the whole earth. And yet the Witches are made beleeve that at their request, and to pleasure them by fulfilling their wrath, their spirits do lame and kill both men and beasts. And then to spread this opinion among the people, these subtill spirits bewray them and will have them openly confesse that they have done such great things, which all the Divels at any man's request could never do" [p. iv in reprint].

The book is not paged—so the references are to the modern reprint.

The book is cast in the form of a dialogue, which gives the author opportunity of picturing to us vividly the beliefs and condition of mind in which men lived under the shadow of the witch-craze. Thus Samuel, one of the interlocutors, complains—"In good sooth I may tell it to you as to my friend, when I go but into my closet I am afraid, for I see now and then a Hare; which my conscience giveth me is a witch, or some witches spirit, she stareth so upon me. And sometimes I see an ugly Weasill runne through my yard, and there is a foule great Cat sometimes in my barne, which I have no liking unto" [pp. 8–9].

"Daniel. You never had no hurt done yet, had you, by any witch?

"Sam. Trust me I cannot tell, but I feare me I have, for there be two or three in our town which I like not, but especially an old woman. I have bene as carefull to please her as ever I was to please mine own mother and to give her euer and anon one thing or other, and yet methinkes she frownes at me now and then. And I had a hog which eate his meat with his fellows, and was very well to our thinking over night, and in the morning he was starke dead. My wife hath had five or sixe hens even of late dead. Some of my neighbors wish me to burn something alive, as a hen or a hog" [p. 9].

Speaking of a witch, he says, "She had three or foure impes, some call them puckrels, one like a grey cat, another like a weasel, another like a mouse" [pp. 9–10].

Another witch had three—"The Cat would kill kine, the Weasill would kill horses, the Toade would plague men in their bodies" [p. 20].

"I denie not but that the divell worketh by them (witches). And that they ought to be put to death" [p. 14].

"I know that witches and conjurers are seduced and become the vassals of Satan: they be his servants and he not thiers as you speak" [p. 14].

Gifford's theory is that God gives the demons power to inflict injuries as punishments; the demons inflame the witches to send them to inflict these injuries. "But this doth not cleare the witches at all; for their sinne is in dealing with divels and that they imagine that their Spirits do these harmes, requested and hired by them" [p. 33].

It is all a refinement which naturally was ineffective in repressing popular superstition and the desire to root out witches.

"As I said before, here is the deepe craft of Sathan, that he will covet to be sent by witches, whereas indeed God hath sent him, seeing none can send him but God." Also, disease and death come by natural causes which the devil foresees and inflames the witch to send her imps and think that she did it [p. 34].

An efficient cause of the spread of accusations of witches was the "cunning" man. From the constant allusions to this it appears that when any one lost health or cattle or suffered other misfortunes he would resort to one of these practitioners, whose reputations spread for many miles around and who were sorcerers in league with Satan. The applicant would be told that he was bewitched and would be advised to try some counter charm—burning a hen or a hog—and if necessary would be shown the image of the witch in a glass or crystal, when he would scratch and arrest her and she would be tried and executed—thus making Satan triumph all around.

It is another of Satan's subtilties to cause suspicion of innocent parties so that juries convict them and thus incur blood-guiltiness. Gifford admits that the witch should suffer death, but he wants justice to be more wary and circumspect.

(Apparently in England at this time witches were not credited with tempests—H. C. L.) for Gifford says, "In Germany and other countries the divels have so deluded the witches as to make them beleeve that they raise tempests of lightnings and thunders" [p. 94].

He holds that, if it is proved that a witch has dealt with devils she should be put to death, whether any injury can be traced to her or not, and the law is imperfect in requiring proof of murder to justify capital punishment [p. 95].

Subsequently he says that, if there is proof of the killing of a beast, it is pillory and defamation for ever. If a second offence and conviction follow, it is death [p. 100].

"Let it be graunted that the Jury upon Satan's testimony or suspitions and common fame sometimes hitteth right, which yet I feare is very seldome" [p. 101].

It is noteworthy that in a long discourse over the power of Satan and of witches in all details there is no word about flying in the air or assemblies and Sabbats. It looks as though there was in England at this period no popular belief of the kind. Nor is there anything about sexual intercourse.

MASON, JAMES.—*The Anatomie of Sorcerie, wherein the wicked impietie of Charmers, Inchanters and such like is discovered and confuted.* London, 1612.

This book is rather intended to prove the wickedness of all occult arts against those who defended them.

All that "the magitians, witches, sorcerers, inchanters and such like" do is really done by the devil, who lays down the rules for them; and the charms, etc. which they use are but a cover to conceal his work (p. 22).

Admits that sorcerers can cure diseases in which physicians fail and ascribes it to the superior knowledge and experience of the devil as to diseases and remedies (pp. 38, 70).

Witches or sorcerers are always at the devil's command (p. 45).

"I am perswaded that this kinde of wickedness (albeit the good and wholesome laws which are made against it) was never more practised amongst us, especially for the recouery of health. For many, I might say most men now a daies, if God doe not restore them to health when and how they thinke good, they will leaue God's ordinarie meanes by physicke and will goe to sorcerers" (p. 79).

Commenting on Deut. xviii, he says, "And of this sort seeme our witches to be among us, whose doings in this behalfe it would be long and needles to recount, seeing that they be so well knowne by common speach and experience" (p. 86).

The object of the book is to prove that all helpful sorcery and divination is a pact express or implied with Satan and that its practitioners and those who consult them are condemned by Scripture. Witchcraft is condemned by implication, though it is not the special object of the book, and of course its reality is assumed.

DAVENPORT, JOHN.—*The Witches of Huntingdon.* London, 1646.

Probably connected with the career of Hopkins were the Witches of Huntingdon. In March and April, 1646, they were on trial—Elizabeth Weed, John Winnick, Frances Moore,

Elizabeth Chandler, Ellen Shepheard, Anne Desborough, Jane Wallis. Their confessions bear a singular resemblance to each other. They are tempted by a demon, sometimes in human shape, sometimes in that of a small animal, such as a rat or a mouse. They renounce God and worship him; he gives them two familiar imps, usually in the shape of a cat and a dog. The demon has intercourse with the women—unless these refuse—and the imps suck their blood and are at their service to injure men and cattle, and sometimes to bring them money. There is also a John Clarke Jr., on trial, but he denies. There are a few incriminating witnesses, but their testimony amounts to little and the confessions bear on their face that they are made to meet the exigencies of the prosecution. There is nothing in all of these confessions about the Sabbat. If executions followed, it was a complete travesty of justice—and that such was the case there can be no doubt, as the little book is dedicated to the Justices of the Peace for the County of Huntingdon—apparently as a vindication, for the Dedication says that "more full and cleare confessions, more satisfactory evidence and a clearer conviction could not be in a case of this nature," and speaks of the "Tryall and Conviction" of the accused.

Filmer, Sir Robert.—*Advertisement to the Jurymen of England touching Witches.* London, 1684. [First ed., 1653.] (Printed with *The Free-holders Grand Inquest.*)

After reciting the statute 1 Jacob., cap. 12, Filmer observes, "Although the Statute runs altogether in the disjunctive *Or*, and so makes every single crime capital, yet the Judges usually by a favorable interpretation take the disjunctive *Or* for the copulative *And*, and therefore ordinarily they condemn none for Witches, unless they be charged with the Murdering of some persons" (p. 315).

His object is to define accurately what is a witch and he takes as his basis the definitions of Del Rio and of Wm. Perkins in his "Discourse upon Witchcraft." Perkins (1538–1602) was a Calvinist divine of high standing whose works, in three folio volumes, have been repeatedly reprinted. The Discourse probably dates towards the close of the sixteenth century and in it he enumerates eighteen signs or proofs of witchcraft. His definition is "Witchcraft is an Art serving for the working of Wonders, by the assistance of the Devil, so far as God shall permit." To this end a compact

is necessary, which he describes: "The Witch as a slave binds himself by Vow to believe in the Devil and to give him either Body or Soul or both, under his handwriting or some part of his Blood. The Devil promiseth to be ready at his vassal's command to appear in the likeness of any Creature, to consult and to aid him for the procuring of Pleasure, Honour, Wealth or Preferment; to go for him, to carry him any whither and to do any command."—Filmer, pp. 316–19.

From this Filmer argues that the witch is only an accessory before the Fact and the Devil is the principal: "Now the difficulty will be how the *accessory* can be *duly and lawfully convicted and attainted,* according as our Statute requires, unless the Devil, who is the Principal, be first convicted or at least outlawed; which cannot be, because the Devil can never be lawfully summoned according to the Rules of our Common Law."—Ib., p. 321.

Perkins alludes to the devil's mark, but only as a presumption.—Ib., p. 325.

Perkins allows the use of torture, which "may be lawfully used, howbeit not in every case, but only upon strong and great presumption and when the party is obstinate."—Ib., p. 325.

Perkins includes among what he calls "less sufficient proofs:" "scratching of the suspected party and the present recovery therefrom;" "burning the thing bewitched, as a Hog, an Ox or other Creature, it is imagined a forcible means to cause the Witch to discover herself;" "burning the thatch of the suspected parties house;" the water ordeal—all which, says Perkins, are "after a sort practices of Witchcraft, having no power by God's Ordinance." Also the cunning man who shows in a glass the face of the witch; also the accusation by one witch of another; also evil following threats; also the dying assertion of the bewitched that such a one has bewitched him. "All these proofs which men in place have ordinarily used be either false or insufficient signs."—Filmer, pp. 327–8.

Perkins has only two sufficient proofs: (1) Confession, though he admits that the confession may be untrue through desire for death, or hope of being set at liberty, or through simplicity—and that "many confess of themselves things false and impossible, That they are carried through the Air in a moment, that they pass through key-holes and clefts of Doors; that they be sometimes turned into Cats, Hares and other Creatures and such like; all which are meer fables and

things impossible." (2) "Two witnesses avouching upon their own knowledge either that the party accused hath made League with the Devil, or hath done some known practices of Witchcraft, or hath invocated the Devil or desired his help."—Ib., pp. 329–30.

To the objection that under these limitations "it will be impossible to put any one to death," he answers "yet there is a way to come to the knowledge thereof—Satan endeavoreth the discovery and useth all means to disclose Witches."—Ib., p. 330.

Perkins also gives a salutary warning—"I advise all Jurors, that as they be diligent in their zeal of Gods glory, so they would be careful what they do and not to condemn any party suspected upon bare presumptions without sound and sufficient proofs, that they be not guilty through their own rashness of shedding innocent blood."—Filmer, p. 332.

These extracts from Perkins are very interesting, for, while they show a belief in witchcraft, as might be expected from a divine saturated with Scripture, they show that the matter was debated in England in a spirit totally different from that prevailing on the Continent.

Filmer's comments throughout upon Perkins show him to be, if not a disbeliever in witchcraft, at least not sharing popular superstitions on the subject and desirous to diminish persecution.

In his preface Filmer says, "The late Execution of Witches in Kent occasioned this brief Exercitation, which addresses itself to those who have not deliberately thought upon the great difficulty in discovering what or who a Witch is." And in the second part, "Of the Hebrew Witch," he shows how different was the witch of the Scriptures from the current beliefs—"Setting aside the case of Job (wherein God gave a special and Extraordinary Commission) I do not find in Scripture that the Devil or Witch, or any other, had power ordinarily permitted them either to kill or hurt any man, or to meddle with the Goods of any."—Ib., p. 333.

The paging in these references comes from the fact that this tract is printed in a volume with the Freeholder's Grand Inquest, 4th Impression, London, 1684. Probably written at an earlier date. I cannot identify in Hutchinson "the late executions in Kent" which gave occasion for it.

I have not the original of Wagstaffe's book,[1] but the German translation issued Halle, 1711, dedicated to Christian Thomasius, under the title "Gründlich ausgeführte Materie von der Hexerey, oder die Meynung derer jenigen so da glauben dass es Hexen gebe deutlich widerlegt."

[1] "The Question of Witchcraft Debated; or a discourse against their opinion that affirm witches." 1669; 2 ed., London, 1671.

Wagstaffe proves syllogistically that the believers are more rightly to be called Heathen than the unbelievers to be stigmatized as Atheists, for witchcraft infers a plurality of Gods, and it is absurd to hold that the devil performs what is attributed to him by permission of God, when he can predict the future, transform men into beasts and resurrect the dead.

Ludovick Muggleton, for all his extravagance in esteeming himself a prophet of God, had sense enough to discern the unreality of witchcraft. "People being ignorant and fearful of them doth many times disturb and search their Blood with Extremity of Fear which they have of one that is suspected for a Witch, and so by their own Fear and Imagination they come to be bewitched. . . . So that there is no such thing as People do vainly imagine as for Spirits to suck Witches, but all the Devil that is, is their own dark Reason; and that Spirit that doth bewitch any Creature, it doth arise out of their own imagination. . . . But as for raising Spirits without Bodies, there is no Witch, no Conjuror, or Magician, nor the greatest Artist in the World can do; neither can any Spirit assume any Body but its own."—A Letter to Mr. Fewterill, March 29, 1660, in A True Interpretation of the Witch of Endor (2. ed., London, 1724) pp. 48–9. [1. ed., London, 1669.]

He explains the Witch of Endor as an illusion produced on Saul by the Witch; and her vision of Samuel was the product of her imagination and the words of Samuel to Saul were the voices of his conscience.

Casaubon, Meric.—*Treatise proving Spirits, Witches and Supernatural Operations by pregnant Instances and Evidences.* London, 1672.

He thinks nothing of classing Reginald Scot among atheists and "confident illiterate wretches," although he admits never to have read his book (p. 40).

On the other hand, he asks, "And if there be laws against calumniators and false witnesses . . . what punishment do they deserve that dare publickly traduce all the venerable Judges of so many Christian Kingdoms as either ignorant wretches or wilful murderers?" (p. 47).

Casaubon has an appetite for the marvellous which accepts everything, from the wild tales concerning Apollonius of Tyana to the gossip of an old crone in the next parish, fully exemplifying his quotation from Minucius Felix, "In incredi-

bili verum, et in credibili mendacium"—like Glanvil, to whom the more impossible a thing is the more readily it is to be believed (p. 155).

GLANVIL, JOSEPH.—*Sadducismus Triumphatus, Or full and plain Evidence concerning Witches and Apparitions.* In Two Parts. London, 1700.[1]

Of course the main trouble of the opponents of witchcraft was to explain away the passages of the Bible and the Hebrew legislation which show the profound faith of the Jews in the power of the practitioners of magic. Balthasar Bekker, as we shall see, paid the penalty of his daring exegesis in the effort to argue it away. This exposed all the reformers to the reproach of atheism and Sadducism.

The learned Dr. Henry More in his refutation of Webster in 1678 [in a letter printed at the beginning of Glanvil's book] has little trouble in exposing the failure of Webster in his attempt to reconcile Scripture with his views. The spirit of the controversy is revealed in his question, "But what will this profane Shuffler stick to do in a dear regard to his beloved Hags, of whom he is sworn Advocate and resolved Patron, right or wrong?"—Prefatory letter, p. 16.

So Webster's explanation of the victory of Moses over Pharaoh's magicians "is the basest derogation to the glory of that Victory and the vilest reproach against the God of Israel and the Person of Moses, that either the malicious wit of any Devil can invent or the dulness of any sunk soul can stumble upon."—Ib., p. 21.

Yet More himself not only rejects the belief that the witch can be bodily transformed into a cat or a hare, that the demon sucks her and has carnal intercourse with her, but asserts that "neither Dr. Casaubon nor anyone else holds any such thing."—Ib., p. 31.

Yet the witch-trials until the end continued to be full of such things.

More's angry abusiveness indicates a consciousness of the growth of disbelief in the intelligent classes and this is acknowledged by Glanvil himself in his Preface (dated Bath, June 8, 1668), when he describes this "sort of *Infidels*, though they are not ordinary among the meer Vulgar, yet are they numerous

[1] The writings of Glanvil dealing with witchcraft are: The Vanity of Dogmatizing, 1661; recast under the title Scepsis Scientifica, 1665; Some Philosophical Considerations touching Witches and Witchcraft, 1666—the 4th ed., 1668, entitled, A Blow at Modern Sadducism; republished with further additions by Henry More under the title, Saducismus Triumphatus, London, 1681, 3d ed., 1700. It was More who spelled "Sadducismus" with one d. See Notestein, *History of Witchcraft in England*, pp. 286–7.

in a little higher rank of Understandings. And those that know anything of the World know that most of the looser Gentry and the small pretenders to Philosophy and Wit, are generally Deriders of the belief of Witches and Apparitions." —Glanvil, Preface.

In 1666 Glanvil issued "Some philosophical considerations touching the being of witches and witchcraft" (Graesse, p. 59).

In 1677 Webster published his Displaying of supposed Witchcraft to refute the views of Casaubon, Glanvil and Henry More the Platonist.

In 1681 Glanvil retorted with his Saducismus Triumphatus, reprinted in 1700 and 1726 (Graesse, p. 58). In this 1681 book Glanvil attacks Webster and seeks everywhere to controvert him with little courtesy. (See p. 1318 for final conclusion.)

This is the earliest date for the Saducismus that I can find in Graesse or Allibone. There must, however, have been an earlier one, for the 1700 edition is termed the third and the original preface retained in it is dated Bath, June 8, 1668. That is therefore probably the date of the first edition. In it (p. 36) he speaks of examining Scot's "Discovery" but says nothing of Webster's book, showing that it had not yet appeared. He also refutes the opinion of Episcopius.

In this preface he speaks of the favorable reception of his "Considerations." This essay is probably the same as the opening part of the Saducismus, of which the half-title is "Some Considerations about Witchcraft in a letter to Robert Hunt Esq." This is apparently the case, judging by some remarks of the publisher at the end.

Glanvil says "and Thousands in our own Nation have suffered Death for their vile compacts with Apostate-Spirits."—P. I, p. 3.

To the objections advanced against witches, after anointing, flying to the Sabbat, their transformation into cats, hares, etc., their raising tempests by their spells and their being "sucked (this sucking is sucking of blood—H. C. L.) in a certain private place in their bodies by a Familiar" he commences by asserting, "The more absurd and unaccountable these Actions seem, the greater confirmations are they to me of the Truth of those Relations and the Reality of what the Objectors would destroy." This *credo quia impossibile* would seem to settle the standard of reason of this Fellow of the Royal Society and renders unnecessary the succeeding arguments to prove the reasonableness of all these assumed facts. —Ib., pp. 6–10.

Note that Dr. Henry More, as above, says that nobody believes some of these things.

Rejects the theory that the marvels of witchcraft are the effects of imagination and fascination.—Ib., p. 16.

Admits that there are cheats and impostors, but argues that an occasional imposition does not justify a universal negative.—Ib., p. 19.

He proceeds *seriatim* to discuss and answer the arguments brought against Witchcraft. (It is curious that throughout there is no allusion to Incubi and Succubi, as though this feature formed no part of the belief. Henry More, as we have seen above, includes it among the matters which he says no one believes—and which yet Glanvil believed.—H. C. L.)

The Sadducismus Triumphatus consists of two parts. Part I is the "Considerations" and Part II consists of narratives, adduced in support of the author's views. In the editions of 1681, etc., after Glanvil's death, there is much matter interposed by Dr. Henry More. In Glanvil's Preface he says that he added the account of the Drummer of Tedworth to the second and third editions of his Considerations. This brought upon him much correspondence. It was reported that he had admitted that the Drummer was proved to be a cheat and Webster so stated in his "Displaying." This led him to resolve to reprint the whole and to add to it a collection of the best attested stories as a correction of the "stupid Sadducism and Infidelity of the Age."

This, then, is the genesis of the "Sadducismus Triumphatus"—subsequent to the appearance of Webster's book. There is no date to the Preface, but I presume it may be assigned to 1681. No—a publisher's advertisement appended says that it was found among his papers, apparently unfinished.

In this Preface he again alludes to the growing incredulity. "But of all Relations of Fact there are none like to give a Man such trouble and disreputation as those that relate to Witchcraft and Apparitions, which so great a party of Men (in this Age especially) do so rally and laugh at and, without more ado, are resolved to explode and despise as meer Winter Tales and old Wives Fables."—Preface.

Glanvil includes Wagstaffe with Webster as the object of his attacks. (This is Wagstaffe *On Witchcraft*, London, 1671.—Translation in Germany, Halle, 1711.—H. C. L.)

Glanvil seems to have lost some of his beliefs. In the Introduction to the Saducismus he defines witchcraft as the performance by the Spirit "sometimes immediately, as in Transportation and Possessions, sometimes by applying other Natural Causes, as in raising Storms and inflicting Diseases, sometimes using the Witch as an Instrument and either by

the Eyes or Touch conveying Malign Influences: And these things are done by vertue of a Covenant or Compact betwixt the Witch and an Evil Spirit." Then he adds that Webster and Wagstaffe do not regard this definition as complete, but add carnal copulation with the Devil and real transformation into an Hare, Cat, Dog, or Wolf, but he will not have them make definitions for him "And I have described the Witch and Witchcraft that sober men believe and assert."—Ib., P. II, pp. 4–5.

He admits, however, that the body of mankind is credulous and believes in copulation and transformation; that there are ten thousand silly lying stories current among the vulgar; that melancholy and imagination can beget strange fancies, such as many stories of witchcraft and apparitions; that inquisitors and witch-finders have destroyed innocent persons for witches; and that watching and torture have extorted confessions from those not guilty.—Ib., pp. 6–7.

He asserts that these concessions cover most of what is argued in Webster's and Wagstaffe's and other Witch-Advocates' books.—Ib., p. 7.

He also alludes (p. 9) to the author of the Doctrine of Devils (which I cannot identify—H. C. L.).

Also (pp. 17, 20) to another book, "The Grand Apostasie," which asserts belief in witchcraft as an idolatrous and atheistical doctrine.[1]

Glanvil's "Considerations" are in the form of a letter to Robert Hunt, Esq. (This Hunt seems to have been a justice of the peace and an enthusiastic witch-finder.—H. C. L.) He supplied Glanvil with his "Book of Examinations of Witches," in which Glanvil finds evidence of a Hellish Knot of them—"And had not his Discoveries and Endeavours met with great Opposition and Discouragement from some then in Authority, the whole Clan of those Hellish Confederates in these parts had been justly exposed and punished."—Ib., P. II, pp. 67–8.

This was in 1664.

The Sabbat of the English witches is very much the same as that of their Continental sisters, though somewhat less

[1] Not "another book," but the same: "The Doctrine of Devils proved to be the Grand Apostacy of these later times" (London, 1676). The Quaker historian Sewel, who translated it into Dutch (Amsterdam, 1691), makes its author "N. Orchard, Predikant in Nieuw England" (this may mean Pennsylvania), and Balthasar Bekker thought his debt to it great.—B.

elaborate, except that they feast on roast beef and good beer instead of the nauseous matters which the more active imaginations of the southern races describe, and that the worshipping of the devil seems to be omitted.—Ib., pp. 73–81.

In the Book of Examinations by Hunt the evidence and confessions are so detailed and so confirmed one by the other that they seem to carry conviction with them, and their rejection could only be explained by a conviction of the general worthlessness of human testimony.

Trial and execution of Florence Newton of Youghal at Cork in 1661. In this the extracts given are full and detailed and, although hear-say evidence was freely admitted, the whole would seem to be irrefragable, according to the ordinary rules of evidence. The comforting notion that a witch lost her power when arrested seems not to have penetrated there, for she, while in prison, killed a new victim, David Jones, by kissing his hand through the grating of the gaol.—Ib., pp. 90–101.

Julian Cox, an old woman of seventy, was executed at Taunton in 1663 and Judge Archer, who condemned her, was censured for doing so on insufficient evidence. Yet it is hard to see in what it was less convincing than in other cases.—Ib., pp. 101–5.

How easily men of intelligence and learning can deceive themselves by words is seen in Glanvil's proving, by what he calls the Synenergy of the Spiritus Mundanus, the reasonableness of such incidents as those related in these trials. Thus, when a tile from the prison of Florence Newton was heated red-hot and the urine of a bewitched woman was poured upon it, Florence suffered acutely. So in Julian Cox's case, when she killed a man's cattle and he took the ears of the dead beasts and put them on the fire, Julian suddenly appeared, writhing in agony, and snatched them out. In another case the husband of a bewitched woman bottled some of her urine with nails, pins and needles and buried it. The wife recovered and the wizard who had bewitched her died of the counter-charm.—Ib., pp. 109–11.

And these are the sort of facts relied upon to disprove the arguments of Scot and Webster.

Allude to the enormous length of the arguments over Saul and the Witch of Endor, which was a favorite arena for the contending champions.

Miscellanies . . . Collected by J. Aubrey, Esqr., London, 1696, give a vivid picture of the beliefs of the period, when men

lived ever in the consciousness of evil impending from an unknown source and nothing was too extravagant to obtain credence. Yet Aubrey was a Fellow of the Royal Society and eminent as an antiquarian and naturalist.

Boulton, Richard.—*A Compleat History of Magick, Sorcery and Witchcraft.* London, 1715.

No previous author has manifested a more thorough acquaintance with the devil, his objects and methods in seducing human beings to his service. All the old *grimoire* of witchcraft is accepted and no proof is required other than the historical proof presented in the authentic accounts which he has collected and lays before the reader.—Boulton, I, p. 2.

He accepts everything—incubi and succubi, the Sabbat, transportation through the air, the witch-mark, transformation into animals, passage into houses, figurines, raising tempests, causing possession, loss of power when arrested. The surest proof is the insensible mark and the water ordeal, also the sucking of the witch's body by her demon (p. 173).—Ib., pp. 12–23.

No tale is too gross or too unsubstantial to serve as historical proof and a choicer collection of marvellous stories would be hard to find.—Ib., pp. 210–15.

Boulton in 1722 printed "A Vindication of a Compleat History of Magick, Sorcery and Witchcraft" (Allibone, s.v.). Probably in answer to Hutchinson's work.

Case of the Witches of Warboyse, 1593. It is the old story of some children of Mr. Throckmorton, possessed of devils and accusing an old man named Samuel, his wife Agnes and his daughter Alice of sending the demons to torment them. Evidently the matter was somewhat novel, for the trouble lasted from November, 1589, until the trial and execution of the three in April, 1593. It is a pitiful story, in which the Bishop of Lincoln and various clergymen and gentry were concerned. The old woman Alice confessed to the bewitchment and to having done to death the Lady Cromwell, wife of Sir Henry Cromwell, who had fits like the children. The sucking of the witches' blood by their demons, and the scratching of their faces by the bewitched are prominent features.—Ib., pp. 49–152.

Hutchinson, Francis (later Bp.)—*Historical Essay concerning Witchcraft.* London, 1718; 2. ed. 1720, *mihi.* (A German

translation by Th. Arnold, Leipzig, 1726.) He says that his book was written some years before, and might never have seen the light but for the appearance of Boulton's work.—Dedication.

"In our own nation, even since the Reformation, above a hundred and forty have been executed" (Ibidem).

This is putting the number very low.

He says that Samuel Harsnet, afterwards Archbishop of York, in his "Declaration of Egregious Popish Impostures under the pretence of casting out Devils," printed in 1603, treats the belief in the power of witches with coarse but effective ridicule and calls Bodin "a pure sot" (Ibidem).

Rather curious in view of James I. Yet he was made Bishop of Chichester in 1609, of Norwich in 1619 and Archbishop of York in 1629.

He also says that Richard Baxter (the celebrated author of "The Saint's Rest," "A Call to the Unconverted" and innumerable other books—than whom none stood higher among Non-conformists—H. C. L.) in his "Certainty of the World of Spirits" gives full credence to the stories of witches (Ibidem).

Translations of Baxter's book appeared in Germany in 1691, 1713, 1755 and as late as 1838.

T. Ady is frequently referred to as an opponent of witchcraft. Allibone gives his book[1] the date of 1656–61. It is not in Graesse.

The legal position in England in 1560 is exhibited in the case of eight men, who seem to have been substantial citizens, tried at Westminster for conjuration and sorcery, who confessed their wicked acts and by special command of the queen and her council were set in the pillory, after having in open court taken the following oath: "Ye shall swear that from henceforth ye shall not use, practise, devise or put in use, or exercise or cause, procure, counsel, agree, assist or consent to be used, devised, practised, put in use or exercised, any Invocations or Conjurations of Spirits, Witchcrafts, Inchantments or Sorceries, or anything whatsoever touching or in any wise concerning the same, or any of them, to the intent to get or find any Money or Treasure, or to waste, consume or destroy any Person in his Members, Body or Goods, or to provoke any to unlawful Love, or to know, tell

[1] A Candle in the Dark, London, 1656; 2d ed., entitled, A Perfect Discovery of Witchcraft, 1661.

or declare where Goods lost or stolen be come, or for any other Purpose, End or Interest whatsoever. So help you God and the holy Contents of this Book."—Hutchinson, p. 33.

Fifteen witches indicted and twelve condemned at Lancaster in 1612 (p. 47).

Edward Fairfax of Fuyston, York, in 1622 prosecutes six of his neighbors accused by his children in fits. The Grand Jury finds true bills, but the judge so charged the jury that they were acquitted, they being people of good character (p. 48).

Pendle-Forest, Lancashire. Seventeen witches condemned by the contrivance of a boy and his father in 1634 (p. 50).

Chief Justice Holt in 1694 tried Mother Munnings at Bury St. Edmunds; in 1694 Margaret Elnore at Ipswich, in 1695 Mary Guy at Launceton, and in 1696 Elizabeth Horner at Exeter. The evidence in these cases was as convincing as that on which so many had been executed, but all were acquitted (pp. 59–62).

In all, Holt had about eleven witchcraft trials—the last on Sarah Morduck in 1701. All were acquitted (p. 63).

Hutchinson thinks that the three—Susan Edwards, Mary Trembles and Temperance Lloyd, hanged at Exeter in 1682—were the last executions in England. In the thirty-six years since then he has not found a case (pp. 56, 68).[1]

As torture was unknown to the English law it could not be used in the recognized forms, but Hopkins the witch-finder and other enthusiasts invented methods that were more prolonged and equally efficacious. One was placing the accused on a table cross-legged, tying her legs and keeping her in that posture without food or sleep for twenty-four hours—an intolerable torture which would in most cases lead to confession of whatever was wanted (p. 83)—from Gaule's book.

Then there was the sleeplessness torture—walking the accused up and down between two men for as long as was needed (p. 85).

Complaint of Hopkins' proceedings was made in 1645, to Parliament which in place of remedying the evil formed a commission of two prominent Presbyterian ministers with Serjeant Godbold, the Judge of the Assize, to act with the justices, resulting in continuing the executions "in great numbers" (pp. 85–6).

[1] Ewen has since found a later one—Alice Molland, Exeter, 1685 (Witch Hunting and Witch Trials, 1929, p. 43; Witchcraft and Demonianism, 1933, pp. 129, 444).

Scratching was a modified form of torture, though assumed to be for the purpose of relieving the bewitched. The extent to which this was carried is seen in the case of the Witches of Warboyse in 1593, where one of the little bewitched girls kept her nails for the purpose and scratched the face of the unresisting Agnes Samuel, who was holding her in her lap, so furiously that she took off the skin "for the breadth of a shilling," while the victim cried pitifully (Boulton, I, pp. 112, 116).

The sucking that we hear of is done by the imps which serve witches as familiar spirits—they suck her blood, through a little teat, which is searched for as an infallible devil's mark. —Hutchinson, p. 83.

Gaule tells us that when the witch is kept cross-legged for twenty-four hours, a little hole is made in the door for the imps to enter and suck; as they can assume any shape the watchers are told to sweep the room at intervals and to kill any spiders or flies that they may see—if they cannot be killed they are unquestionably imps (p. 83).

When these tests failed, came the water ordeal (p. 85).

Hutchinson speaks of the fondness of the country-people for swimming witches, as much as for bear or bull-baiting (p. 175).

Chief Justice Parker at the summer assizes at Brentwood, 1712, in a case of this kind, when the jury brought in a verdict of manslaughter, gave notice and warning that in future, if the ordeal was used and the accused died, all concerned would be guilty of wilful murder (pp. 175–6).

The clergyman Lowes, whom Hopkins caused to be executed, had borne an irreproachable character during a career of more than fifty years.[1] He was kept awake by watchers for several days and nights till he confessed what was needed and then he was tested by the water ordeal and swam (pp. 89–90).

John Wesley, after describing the case of a girl under strong hysteric attacks, proceeds: "When old Dr. A.——r was asked what her disorder was, he answered, 'It is what formerly they would have called being bewitched.' And why should they not call it so now? Because the infidels have hooted witchcraft out of the world; and the complaisant Christians, in large numbers, have joined with them in the cry. I do not so much wonder at this, that many of these should herein talk like infidels; but I have sometimes been inclined to wonder at the pert, saucy, indecent manner wherein some of those

[1] But see Notestein, *Hist. of Witchcraft in England*, p. 175ff.

trample upon men far wiser than themselves; at their speaking so dogmatically against what not only the whole world, Heathen and Christian, believed in all past ages, but thousands, learned as well as unlearned, firmly believe at this day. I instance Dr. Smollett and Mr. Guthrie, whose manner of speaking concerning witchcraft must be extremely offensive to every man who cannot give up his Bible."—The Journal of the Rev. John Wesley, July 4, 1770 (ed. Everyman's Library, III, p. 412).

VII. Scotland.

"We do not know one case of witch-burning in Scotland before the Reformation except the instance quoted by Dr. Patrick from an anonymous fragmentary chronicle of the reign of James III (1460–88), a political case."—*Athenaeum*, January 4, 1908 (in review of Dr. David Patrick's "The Statutes of the Scottish Church").

This is easily explicable. There was no Inquisition in Scotland and the witch-craze had not penetrated so far. When the Reformation came, the Scriptures were searched and the Levitical laws enforced.

Sinclar or Sinclair, George.—*Satan's Invisible World Discovered*, Edinburgh, 1685. (Reprinted from the original edition, Edinburgh, 1871.)

Sinclar was a mathematician and man of science—professor of philosophy and mathematics in the University of Glasgow, from which he was dismissed in 1666 for non-conformity, to be reinstated after the Revolution of 1688, supporting himself during the interval as a mining engineer. He was versed in physics and made discoveries in hydrodynamics. Such a man might be anticipated to entertain scepticism as to witchcraft, but he was deeply religious, and such scepticism in the Scotland of that day was regarded as atheism. His book went through many editions between 1685 and 1814 and formed during the eighteenth century a part of every cottage library in Scotland. It is a collection of "Relations" of cases well adapted to feed the appetite for the marvellous, the uncritical character of which is illustrated by its even embracing the story of the Pied Piper of Hamelin.

His object in writing he states to be to oppose the rising tide of incredulity, which is practically atheism. It is to guard one of the "Out-works of Religion" assailed by infidelity, which, as he warns unbelievers, "comes on by large *Strides* and enters the *Breach* which they have made. If this prevail, farewell all *Religion*, all *Faith*, all *hope* of a life to come. . . . But what are the Reasons why there is so much disbelief of *Devils*, *Witches*, and *Apparitions?*" He attributes this to the spread of the doctrines of Hobbes, Spinoza and Descartes.

The uncompromising spirit in which was urged this warfare with Satan is seen in his admission, "it is commonly believed that many innocent Persons have suffered as Witches, especially such as have been Tortur'd to a Confession"—which he calmly disposes of: "Let it be so, but will it follow that all suffer after that manner?" He allows that the transformations into cats and hares and "transportation into far Countreys" are ridiculous, but he asserts that "Men and Women have been wronged by the touch of a Witches hand, by the breath and kiss of their mouth, as is well known of late. By their looks . . . as when a Witch sendeth forth from her heart thorow her eyes venemous and poysonful Spirits as Rayes, which lighting upon a man will kill him."—Preface.

Attempt in 1676 to kill Sir George Maxwell of Pollok by means of a waxen image and then of a clay image, with pins. He is nearly dead, when the secret is revealed by a dumb girl, who, though uneducated, understands Latin and Greek. Six witches apprehended. On four of them insensible spots are found—not stated as to the others. Three confess, implicating the rest. The others do not. All six condemned to be burnt—but one of them commuted to imprisonment in consequence of her youth, as she is a girl of thirteen, though she had confessed and implicated her mother and brother.—Sinclar (reprint), pp. 1–18.

Case of Agnes Sympson, 1592—her confession to King James, involving Dr. Fien (or Fian) (pp. 22–8).

The demons at Woodstock, 1649—diary of their exploits (pp. 32–9). (See Sir Walter Scott.—H. C. L.)

Hob Grieve, who served for eighteen years as messenger of the devil to summon the witches to their assemblies is arrested and confesses, 1649 (at Lauder). Accuses so many that the prison will not conveniently hold more. All whom he accuses confess (pp. 45–52).

At Lauder at the same time a woman is accused, not by Grieve, and will not confess. All the rest are condemned to be burnt, but she is excepted. Finding that she is to be left alone in prison, she confesses and is condemned, and entreats to be burnt on Monday with the others. Her confession suspected and she urged by the Ministers to retract, but persists. At the place of execution, when all the preliminary ceremonies have been performed, she cries out—"Now all you that see me this day know that I am now to die as a Witch, by my

own confession, and I free all men, especially the Ministers and Magistrates, of the guilt of my blood. I take it wholly upon my self: my blood be upon my own head. And as I must make answer to the God of Heaven presently, I declare I am as free of Witch-craft as any child; but being delated by a malicious Woman, and put in Prison, under that name of a Witch, disowned by my husband and friends, and seeing no ground of hope of my coming out of Prison, nor ever coming in credit again, through the temptation of the Devil I made up that confession, on purpose to destroy my own life, being weary of it, and chosing rather to die than live." And then she was executed (pp. 52–5).

Now the authorities were not warned by this of the murders which they were daily committing, nor is the truth of her assertion doubted, but the case is gravely cited as an instance of the power of the Devil in tempting this innocent woman in prison to kill herself.

The Drummer of Tedworth, in Wiltshire. Mr. Mompesson, has a vagrant drummer arrested and deprived of his drum, which is placed in Mr. M's house. The house then becomes haunted from April, 1661, to April, 1663, like Woodstock. The drummer at length is arrested and tried and sentenced to transportation, when the annoyances cease, but are resumed on his return (pp. 55–75).

Story of the Devil of Glenluce (Galloway), printed by Sinclar in his Hydrostatics, in 1672, copied by Glanvil in Saducismus Triumphatus, and now reprinted with additions. It is an ordinary case of persecution by devils—like that of Woodstock—continuing two years to the great damage of the afflicted, Gilbert Campbell, a weaver, whose web and cloths were often cut and spoiled. Sinclar had the account from a son of Campbell, who was a student of philosophy at Glasgow. The only peculiarity of the case is the conversations constantly had with the fiend, especially by ministers who came to the house to pray, both parties quoting Scripture. Campbell applied to the Synod of Presbyters, who appointed a committee to examine, and as a consequence ordered a solemn humiliation to be kept throughout the bounds of the Synod for the benefit of the afflicted family. This was in February, 1656, and from that time till April the visitations grew less frequent, and from April to August they ceased entirely, but then recommenced. After a while they ceased (pp. 75–94).

This sort of diabolical persecution of families, without the direct intervention of witches, seems to have been very common; quite a number of cases are recorded by Sinclar. See the case of Andrew Mackie—Supplement, pp. xix–xxxviii.

Bessie Graham, Kilwinning, 1649. This case is curious as showing: (1) the little real importance attached to the witch-mark. The pious minister who relates it enumerates, among other "special Providencies" connected with the case, "that Alexander Bogs came and found the Mark upon her at that very nick of time when there was an inclination to let her go free; which, though it did not say much, yet it was a mean to keep her still in prison." (2) How little evidence was required for condemnation—for the poor creature was put to death. (3) How earnestly a conscientious minister of the Gospel could strive to persuade himself of the guilt of the accused and could hound her to her execution (pp. 109–20).

It is observable in this case, as in many others, that confession was not a prerequisite for condemnation and execution.

The epidemic of witchcraft at Mohra in Sweden, 1682, described at length (pp. 167–86).

Compare this with the account I already have.

Case of Major Weir in 1670—a man of some importance and of high consideration in the church, noted for the piety and eloquence of his prayers and exhortations. At the age of about seventy-six he accuses himself of incest long practised with his sister and other crimes. He and she are put to death. The case excites great attention and is invested by the public with all the attractions of witchcraft, so that Weir's name is handed down as that of one of the foremost wizards of Scotland. The general modern opinion is that he was insane. Numerous statements of the case are given in the Supplement to this edition. His house remained untenanted for more than a century, and when at last in the nineteenth century a man was found bold enough to attempt to occupy it, a single night was sufficient for him, and for another half-century it remained empty.—Ib., Supplement, pp. xviii–xix.

Case of Christian Shaw, daughter of John Shaw of Bargarran, 1696–7. She was but eleven years of age, quarrelled with a serving maid of her father's, pretended to be bewitched, and caused seven miserable old women to be burnt. —Ib., pp. xxxix–xlvii.

It is curious that when she grew up she introduced the manufacture of sewing thread into Scotland. Bargarran thread was long celebrated.

Witches of Pittenweem, 1704. On the accusation of a young man who pretended to be bewitched, and who was subsequently recognized as an impostor, Janet Cornfoot was tortured, and though no proof could be had against her was murdered by the rabble under circumstances of almost incredible brutality. Another of the accused, Beatrix Laing, refused to confess; she was tortured by pricking and kept without sleep for five days till she broke down and admitted what was required. Then she revoked and was placed in the stocks and then confined in the Thieves' Hole, after which she was kept for five months in a dark dungeon. Mr. Cowper and the magistrates were endeavoring all this time to get the Privy Council to prosecute, but through the interference of the Earl of Balcarres and Lord Anstruther all the women were admitted to bail (the £8 Scots alluded to in another narrative—H. C. L.). Beatrix, who had means and was the wife of Wm. Brown, late treasurer of the burgh, was afraid to remain at her home, lest she should share the fate of Janet Cornfoot, and went wandering in distress through the land. She applied to the Privy Council for protection, which ordered the magistrates to defend her and appointed a committee to investigate the matter. The magistrates, though forbidden to try the case, fined the prisoners before letting them go. The ringleaders of the mob fled but were subsequently allowed to return and nothing was done to punish the murderers.—Ib., pp. xlviii–li.

This is followed (pp. li–lxix) with a detailed account of the case of Patrick Morton, the accuser of the women. His fits and talks with the supposed witches bear a very curious resemblance to those of Christian Shaw. He was her imitator, for the Bargarran case had been printed *in extenso* and had attracted wide attention; he had evidently studied it—and possibly she may have had some precursor whom she followed.

The affair excited much controversy at the time, and many of the tracts are given in the Supplement, pp. xlviii–xci. A short account is given in the 2d of the "Additional Relations" of Sinclar.

The case is very interesting as:

1. A late example of the employment of torture.
2. Showing the interference of the Privy Council, which would not grant a special commission for trial.

3. Explaining other cases of diabolical persecution. Patrick Morton, the pretended sufferer, was finally acknowledged to be an impostor. He was a boy of sixteen. Yet his case is as substantially vouched for and described in all its marvellous details as any others of those on the strength of which hundreds of wretches were judicially executed.

4. Illustrating the authority and influence of the Ministers in these affairs. In this case, Mr. Patrick Cowper, the Minister, is seen exercising authority equal to that of the Baillies superintending the investigations, and, from first to last, assuming the guilt of the accused as proved. Also, when the unlucky Janet Cornfoot escaped, she was seized by Mr. Gordon, minister of Leuchars, and sent back to Mr. Cowper. See Supp., pp. lxxii, lxxv.

As the editor observes—"In places where the Minister was inflamed with a holy zeal against the devil and his emissaries (such as Pittenweem and Torryburn) the parish became a perfect hot-bed for the rearing of witches; and so plentiful a crop did it produce that it appeared nothing else could thrive. But in places where the Minister had some portion of humanity, and a little common sense, the devil very rarely set foot on his territories, and Witchcraft was not to be found."—Ib., p. xci.

House of the Minister of Kinross troubled by spirits, 1718. —Ib., p. xci.

It seems to have been a favorite rôle for children to accuse old women of bewitching them. In 1720 Patrick Sandelands, third son of James Lord Torpichon, under instructions, it is said, from a knavish governor, had fits similar to the above and laid the blame on certain old women and a man of West Calder, Linlithgow. Lord Torpichon had them seized; ministers took up the matter and made the most of it, with fasts and sermons. A contemporary account says that five of the accused had already confessed to bewitching the boy and to many other evil deeds. Two of them died in prison. The Crown Counsel, however, refused to prosecute and Lord Torpichon began to see through the cheat. The boy was sent to sea in the navy; he is said at one time to have tried his fits, but discipline cured him; he became a good officer and finally perished in a storm.—Ib., pp. xciv–xcix.

The popular exaggerations connected with the Witch of Calder may be seen in the "Additional Relations" added to Sinclar's book (pp. 262–4) where the diablerie is equal to any of the older stories.

The impression left by Sinclar's book is that witchcraft was by no means so prevalent in Scotland as I have imagined. Sinclar's book is by no means large and yet he is obliged to rake together stories from England, France, Sweden and Germany in order to make up his assortment—even the Pied Piper of Hamelin being pressed into service.

A Collection of Rare and Curious Tracts on Witchcraft and Second Sight. Edinburgh, 1820.[1]

A contemporary account relates the origin of the trials in which Dr. Fian suffered. In Trenent, Geillies Duncan, servant of David Seaton the deputy bailiff, attracted attention by some cures that were deemed miraculous. Thereupon he tortured her with the pilliwinkes on her fingers and then with a cord around her head, but could not extort a confession. She was then searched for the devil's mark, which was found on her throat; the identifying of this was always followed by confession and it succeeded here. She accused many persons, who were arrested; among them were Barbara Naper, a woman of good repute in Edinburgh who had bewitched to death Archibald, Earl of Angus. The two principal accused, however, were Agnes Sampson and Dr. Fian (or John Cuningham), who kept a school at the Saltpans.

King James's attention was drawn to the matter and he had Agnes Sampson brought to Holyrood House and examined before him, but she would confess nothing. Remanded to prison she was tortured with the rope around the head for an hour, shaved from head to foot to discover the devil's mark, and on its being found she confessed whatever was required of her, confirming the evidence against the others. Subsequently brought before the king and his council she told a series of wonderful stories, including two attempts upon James's life, against whom the devil had expressed the strongest hatred and, when asked the reason, stated that the king was the greatest enemy he had in the world. When James declared her to be a liar, she convinced him of her truth by stating what had passed between him and his wife on their wedding night at Upslo in Norway. Two hundred witches had sailed over the sea in sieves and with a cat, christened and otherwise prepared for the purpose, had raised a great tempest to wreck him on his return voyage.

As for Dr. Fian, he was clerk or secretary of the Sabbat and was the only man admitted to these gatherings. He could not be brought to confess by the "thrawing" of his head with

[1] "This," says John Ferguson, in his prized *Bibliographical Notes on the Witchcraft Literature of Scotland* (Edinburgh Bibliographical Society, 1896–7), "is one of the best of the reprints of rare witchcraft tracts." In the Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, whose successive volumes are now adding so much to our knowledge of Scottish witch-trails, David Masson, who edits the volume for 1585–92, speaking (p. 591, note) of the "special interest" of "young King James" "in the trials and examinations of this class of his criminal subjects," thinks he "was already ambitious of being a prime authority in the science of witchcraft."—B.

a rope, nor yet by the boot—"the most severe and cruell paine in the worlde"; but the other witches suggested that his tongue be examined, when under it were found two pins thrust in to the head, on the withdrawal of which he spoke freely. He was brought before the king, where he confessed his evil practices in full detail and signed the statement. In his prison he then repented and professed the most earnest desire to save his soul, but the devil appeared to him and he relapsed. He managed to escape and betook himself to the Saltpans, where he was apprehended and brought back. Then he maintained absolute silence; the devil's mark was sought for on him, but could not be found. He was cruelly tortured. His nails were plucked out and needles thrust in; then the boot was resorted to and used until his legs were crushed so that the marrow of the bones exuded, but all to no purpose; under the influence of the devil he would only say and repeat that his former confession was false and had been extorted by agony. The king and council therefore condemned him to death; he was strangled and burnt on Castle Hill "on a Saterdie in the end of Januarie last past," 1591. (In 1591 O. S. Saturday occurred on January 23 and 30.—H. C. L.) —News from Scotland: declaring the Damnable Life of Dr. Fian (Rare and Curious Tracts, pp. 17–34).

The other witches are described as still in gaol.

Lecky (*History of Rationalism*, I, p. 123) says that James personally superintended Fian's torture. The above popular account is probably incorrect in many details. It is inconsistent with the brief allusion to the matter in *Superstition and Force*, p. 573.

There was politics mixed up in all this. Sir James Melvil, who was present in these affairs, in his Memoirs states that the Earl of Bothwell was accused by many witches who were taken in Lothian of designs on the king's life. He came to Edinburgh and placed himself in ward in the Castle. We hear of Amy Simpson (the Agnes Sampson of the above), Effie Machalloum and Barbary Napier (who figures in the previous account). Also of a Richard Graham who was brought to Edinburgh and examined by James (Melvil being present). He denied having anything to do with witches but said he had a familiar spirit. Bothwell had sent for him to aid him in gaining the king's goodwill and he had given the earl a charm for that purpose. It failed and Bothwell asked him to get the king wrecked; he said he could not, but that Amy Simpson

could. This he affirmed several times and was burnt with Simpson and many other witches.—Extract from Sir James Melvil's Memoirs (ib., pp. 36–9).

In Pittenweem, in 1704, a young man named Patrick Morton, subsequently admitted to be a fraud, had a mysterious illness which the doctors could not relieve. He accused a number of women of bewitching him. The minister, Mr. Cowper, and the baillies took up the matter vigorously and arrested the witches. Those in charge of them applied the sleep torture by pinching and pricking them and elicited several confessions—renouncing God for the devil, meetings held with him and the like. Janet Corphat, one who had confessed, when visited in the prison by the Earl of Killie and other noblemen, stated that her confession had been extorted by the torture and revoked it. Mr. Cowper then had her removed from the tolbooth and confined under the steeple, for fear of her perverting the others who had confessed. She escaped, but was brought back on January 30, 1705, to Mr. Cowper, who refused to receive her, and she was placed in the house of Nicholas Lawson, whose wife was one of the women suspected of witchcraft. A rabble collected, seized her and for three hours beat and tormented her in various ingenious ways without interference, finally leaving her dead in the street—for which nobody was punished. There was another death—one Thomas Brown, also one of the accused, who was said to have been starved in the prison. The matter was attracting unpleasant attention and the baillies released the other witches, fining them £8 Scots apiece.—Letter from a Gentleman in Fife, and Answer etc. (ib., pp. 69–94).

If the reformers followed the Church in extirpating witchcraft, it was because of their recurrence to the Bible as the norm of all law. This is instanced in an indictment for witchcraft in 1679, where "the law of God particularlie sett down in the 20 chapter of Leviticus and eighteen chap. of Dewtronomie" is cited before the laws of the kingdom and "the 73 act, 29 parliament Q. Marie" as defining witchcraft "to be ane horreid abominable and capitall cryme punishable with the paines of death and confiscatiown of moveables."—The Witches of Barrowstouness (Rare and Curious Tracts, p. 95).

Why not instance the more emphatic Exod., xxii, 18, "Thou shall not suffer, etc."?

The dittay or indictment against the witches of Borrowstones is issued by a commission appointed by the privy council for the trial and judging of Annaple Thomsone, Margaret Pringle, Margaret Hamilton, Wm. Craw, Bessie Vickar and another Margaret Hamilton, all of Borrowstownes. It charges them with surrendering themselves to the devil, body and soul; having intercourse with him, holding meetings with him where they danced and drank ale, etc. Margaret Pringle has "bein ane witch thir many yeeres bygane." Margaret Hamilton "has bein the devill's servant these eight or nine yeeres bygane" and to her he once gave "ane fyve merk peice of gold, whilk a lyttil efter becam ane sklaitt stone." The other Margaret Hamilton "has bein ane witch and the devill's servant thertie yeres since."

The commission consists of eight persons, any three of whom can act. On November 29, 1679, four of them issue their precept to the sheriffs to appear before them on December 19 in the tolbooth of Borrowstones and to assemble "ane assyse of honest and famous persones," not exceeding the number of forty five together with witnesses acquainted with the facts. The "inqueist [is] to passe upon the assyse each persone." Then follows "ane list of the Persones to be warned to passe upon the Assyse for judging the Witches in Borrowstones." This list comprises 13 names of the Barronie of Carridin; 12 of the Town of Borrowstones; 12 of the Barronie of Kinneill; and 13 of the Barronie of Pollmont. The next document is the warrant for burning the witches. It includes all 6; is dated December 19 (showing that the trial was concluded the same day); it names December 23 as the day of execution; the convicts are "to be taken to the west end of Borrowstones, the ordinar place of execution ther" and "ther to be wirried at a steack till they be dead, and thereafter to have their bodies burnt to ashes." Signed by 5 commissioners.—Ib., pp. 95–103.

In like manner, on September 13, 1678, Isobel Elliott and nine other women were tried together, confessed, convicted, condemned and burnt.—Records of Justiciary (ib., p. 104).

What was the form of trial does not clearly appear. Probably the "assize" acted as a sort of jury, with the commissioners as judges. From the details in the indictment it would seem that previously they had been forced to confess.

"A jury or assize consists of fifteen sworn men (juratores) picked out by the court from a greater number, not exceeding forty-five, who have

been summoned for the purpose by the sheriff and given in list to the defender."—Erskine's Law of Scotland, p. 503.

All crimes, except petty cases, required a jury trial.—Ibidem.

A curious psychological question is raised by the confession of Helene Tailzear. On Sabbath, July 8, 1649, "Mr. Samuel Dowglas preaching at Eymouth, after sermon Helene Tailzear desyred to speik" with him. He came to her with two witnesses, when she confessed her dealings with the devil for two years past. On one occasion he gave her 2 dollars (dolleris), but when she reached home they were but two stones. In company with Isobell Brown, Alison Cairns, Margaret Dobsin and Beatrix Young they went to the house of William Burnett, then lying sick. Margaret Dobson in the shape of a black hen and Beatrix Young in that of "a litill foall" entered the house by way of the chimney head. She refused to go in, when Isobell Brown struck her. Further she declared that Marioun Robisson "wes ane witch and that shee was William Burnit's death." This is signed by Mr. Samuel Douglas, Minister at Coldinghame, and by the two witnesses. —Confessioun of Helene Tailzear (ib., p. 107).

Was Helen Taylor a prisoner at this time? The confession seems to be altogether voluntary.

July 1, 1649, at Dirltown a similar scene was enacting. Menie Halliburton, a prisoner suspect of witchcraft, denounced by her husband Patrick Watson and by Agnes Clerkson, both of whom had been executed for the same, confesses to Mr. John McGhie, minister at Dirltown, and five other witnesses, to cohabitation with the devil, renouncing Christ and her baptism and becoming his servant.—Deposition of Menie Haliburtoun (ib., pp. 109–10).

Accompanying this is a declaration by John Kincaid, a witch-pricker, stating, in June, 1649, that Patrick Watson and his wife Menie Halliburton, suspect of witchcraft, in the castle of Dirltown "of thair awn frie will uncompellit" had desired him "to use my tryall of thame as I had done on utheris, whilk when I had done I found the divillis marke upon the bak syde of the said Patrick Watsone, a littill under the point of his left shoulder, and upon the left syde of the said Menie Halyburtoun hir neck a littill above her left shoulder, whairof they wer not sensible, neither came furth thairof any bloode after I had tryed the samin as exactlie as ever I did any uthers." Signed by him and by six witnesses. —Ib., pp. 111–12.

Trial at Kirkaldy of Wm. Coke and Alison Dick his wife. The evidence of the witnesses is given. Some of it is curious as showing that Alison on several occasions told people about matters at a distance—in one case in Norway—which turned out to be true. The most of it, however, consists of Alison's threats, when angered at refusals of money or food, which threats were followed by misfortunes. They both were burnt November 19, 1636. The expenses of the trial amounted to £34.11 Scots divided *between the Kirk Sessions and the town.* The items of the town's part are:

For ten loads of coals to burn them, 5 merks . .	£3. 6.8
For a tar barrel (The use of the tar barrel was to put the witch in it to be burnt—H. C. L.) . . .	0.14.0
For towes	0. 6.0
To him that brought the executioner	2.18.0
To the executioner for his pains	8.14.0
For his expenses here	0.16.4
For one to go to Finmouth for the laird . . .	0. 6.0
	£17. 1.0

—Trial of William Coke and Alison Dick (ib., pp. 113–24).

Thus burning witches was not cheap and it shows the earnestness of the persecution that poor and thrifty communities would incur the considerable expense of the frequent executions. Note also the fact that the Kirk Sessions shared the outlay.

In another account of 1649, an item of "thrie dollores" is carried out £4.14/. This would make the shilling equal to about 3 1/5 cents, or the pound Scots equal 64 cents nearly, say 5/8 of a dollar.—Ib., p. 125.

The Kirk Sessions, consisting of the minister and elders, seem to have exercised a preliminary jurisdiction over witchcraft and to have had much to do in initiating proceedings and gathering testimony. The minutes of the Session of Torryburn, from June to September, 1704, were occupied with a long investigation and gathering evidence against a number of women. The minister was the presiding officer. The affair commences June 30, at a session "called upon a flagrant rumour that Jean Bizet, wife to Jean Tanochie, had been molested by Satan and had complained of some particular person of the devil's instruments in that trouble that she lay under, whereupon the minister ordered the officer to cite the said Jean Bizet" and also nine others reported as acquainted with the circumstances. The investigation goes on

in a rambling fashion, collecting all sorts of gossip and surmises and suspicions, hearsay and otherwise, against a number of persons, the chief interest of which lies in the fact that all illness and misfortune is at once attributed to the devil working through his servants the witches. One curious item is that in the session of September 3, "Elspeth Williamson being brought in and interrogate if she was a witch, she answered that she would not deny that."—Minutes of the Kirk-Session of Torryburn (ib., pp. 129–44).

In the session of March 30, 1709, there comes in question the Rev. Allen Logan, a minister famous for his skill in discovering witches. Helen Key was accused of speaking disrespectfully of him and saying that she thought that he was daft. Various witnesses testified to her freedom of speech—"therefore they appoint her to sit before the congregation the next Lord's day and to be rebuked after the afternoon sermon."—Ib., pp. 145–6.

The Spottiswoode Miscellany[1] contains abstracts of several witch trials—that of Isobel Young, February 4, 1629, of Agnes Finnie, December 18, 1644—and Notes of Cases from the Books of Adjournal, 1629–1662. Unluckily the places are not given and the details are not such as to convey any accurate account of procedure. The sentences are uniformly "worried at the stake and burnt" in which presumably "worried" means "strangled." The general impression produced is that whenever any one met with misfortune—loss of cattle, breaking a leg, burning of house or barn, sickness or death—it was attributed to witchcraft, especially if some old crone had been offended and muttered threats. There is one case of acquittal recorded—that of Elizabeth Bathgate, June 4, 1634, although the evidence apparently was as strong as in those ending in conviction.—Spottiswoode Miscellany (Edinburgh, 1845), II, pp. 64–6.

The cases show that advocates were allowed to the accused—also that there were assemblages of witches presided over by the demon (Sabbat) and that intercourse with incubi was recognized.

There are cases of Katherine Iswald, 1629.—Elizabeth Bathgate, 1634.—John Brugh, 1643.—Janet Barker and Margaret Lauder, 1643.—John McWilliam Sclater, 1656.—Margaret Anderson, 1658.—John Carse, 1658.—Margaret Taylor,

[1] Printed for the Spottiswoode Society (for Scottish History), Edinburgh, 1844–5.

Janet Black, Katherine Rany and Bessie Paton, 1658.—Bessie Luost and four other women, 1659.—John Douglass and eight women, 1659.—Elspeth Graham and five other women, 1661. —Margaret Bryson and five other women, 1661.—John Kerr and four women, 1661.—Margaret Hutchinson, 1661.—Janet Cock, acquitted in September, 1661, but tried again in November and convicted. Agnes Williamson in 1662.—Ib., II, pp. 61–72.

In a "Diurnal of Occurrences in Scotland," 1652, there is mentioned the case of a simple-minded man, condemned as a witch but reprieved. The writer reports, "The truth is he lived in so poor a condition and was through his simplicity so unable to get a livelyhood that he confessed or rather said anything that was put into his head, by some that first accused him upon the confession of some who have died for witches. By this you may guess upon what grounds many hundreds have heretofore been burnt in this country for witches."—Ib., II, p. 93.

When, in October, 1652, the "English Commissioners for administration of justice in matters criminall" came to Edinburgh, "some were brought before them for witches, two whereof had been brought before the Kirk about the time of the armies coming into Scotland and having confessed were turned over to the civil magistrate. The Court, demanding how they came to be proved witches, they declared that they were forced to it by the exceeding torture they were put to, which was by tying their thumbs behind them and then hanging them up by them; two Highlanders whipt them, after which they set lighted candles to the soles of their feet and between their toes, then burned them by putting lighted candles into their mouths and then burning them in the head; there were six of them accused in all, whereof four dyed of the torture. The judges are resolved to enquire into the business and have appointed the sheriff, ministers and tormentors to be found out and to have an account of the ground of this cruelty."—Ib., II, p. 91.[1]

It appears that under the Commonwealth England undertook to reform the administration of criminal justice in Scotland and that the commissioners were shocked at the abuse of torture.

From this it is easy to understand why we are told in almost all the cases that the accused confessed the charges.

[1] Taken from a letter of the clerk of the Commission to the speaker of the English House of Commons.

MACKENZIE, SIR GEORGE.—*Pleadings in some remarkable Cases before the Supreme Courts of Scotland since the Year 1661.* Edinburgh, 1672.

In one respect Scottish procedure was more equitable than English, for the accused was allowed defence by counsel. We have an example of this by Sir George Mackenzie in a case occurring between 1660 and 1670, in which it is interesting to see the advocate citing the Cap. Episcopi and Ponzinibio to prove that the Sabbat is an illusion. He does not venture to deny the existence of witchcraft, but argues that it should be clearly proved, "since the crime is so improbable and the conclusion so severe." The final summary of his argument describes so accurately the situation existing in Scotland that it is worth transcribing. "Consider how much fancy does influence ordinar Judges in the trial of this crime, for none now labour under any extraordinar Disease but it is instantly said to come by Witch-craft and then the next old deform'd or envyed woman is presently charged with it; from this ariseth a confused noise of her guilt, called *diffamatio* by Lawyers, who make it a ground for seizure, upon which she being apprehended is imprisoned, starved, kept from sleep and oft times tortured: To free themselves from which they must confess, and, having confest, imagine they dare not thereafter retreat. And then Judges allow themselves too much liberty in condemning such as are accused of this crime, because they conclude they cannot be severe enough to the enemies of God, and Assisers are affraid to suffer such to escape as are remitted to them, lest they let loose an enraged Wizard in their neighbor-hood. And thus poor Innocents die in multitudes by an unworthy Martyredom and Burning comes in fashion." In an appeal to the superior court, Sir George felt at liberty to speak freely as to the lower tribunals in which the vast majority of cases were definitely decided, for the poor old crones who were the usual victims had neither the knowledge nor the means to employ skilled advocates and the privilege to do so was, for the most part, as illusory as the crimes with which they were charged.—Mackenzie, pp. 188, 194, 196.

A History of the Witches of Renfrewshire. Paisley, 1877. (First ed., 1809.)

In the extracts given above from a pleading by Sir George Mackenzie, he was an advocate. Perhaps a truer exposition of his opinions is to be found in a section of his "Laws and Customes of Scotland in Matters Criminal" (1678), printed in the History of the Witches of Renfrewshire.

He commences with an elaborate refutation of the skepticism of Weyer, "that great patron of witchcraft." "That there are witches, divines cannot doubt, since the Word of God hath ordained that no witch shall live; nor lawyers in Scotland, seeing our law ordains it to be punished with death. . . . Though charms be not able to produce the effects that are punishable in witches, yet since these effects cannot be produced without the devil and that he will not employ himself at the desire of any who have not resigned themselves wholly to him, it is very just that the users of these should be punished, being guilty at least of apostacy and heresy" (pp. 5, 9). "By the same reason that we should deny witches, we must deny the truth of all history, ecclesiastic and secular" (p. 8).

While he holds witchcraft to be the greatest of crimes, yet from its very horridness he concludes "that of all crimes it requires the clearest relevancy and most convincing probation. And I condemn next to the witches themselves, those cruel and too forward judges, who burn persons by thousands as guilty of this crime (p. 10).

He says that, when he was a justice-depute, he examined some women who had confessed judicially. One, who "was a silly creature," told him under secrecy that she had not confessed because she was guilty "but being a poor creature who wrought for her meat, and being defamed for a witch, she knew she would starve, for no person thereafter would either give her meat or lodging, and that all men would beat her and hound dogs at her and that therefore she desired to be out of the world; whereupon she wept most bitterly and upon her knees called God to witness what she said." Another desired to die because the minister had told her that the devil would claim her and she feared he would haunt her. "Many of them confess things which all divines conclude impossible, as transmutation of their bodies into beasts and money into stones and their going through close doors and a thousand other ridiculous things which have no truth nor existence but in their fancy" (p. 12).

This he ascribes to their fear when apprehended, the close prison in which they are kept, starvation for want of meat and sleep, and tortures and abuse inflicted by their keepers "that hardly wiser and more serious people than they would escape distraction" (p. 11).

"The witnesses and assizers are afraid that if they escape,

that they will die for it, and therefore they take an unwarrantable latitude. And I have observed that scarce ever any who were accused before a country assize of neighbours did escape that trial" (p. 13).

"Nor have the panels any to plead for them and to take notice who are led as witnesses; so that many are admitted who are *testes inhabiles* and suspected" (p. 13).

I suppose that the poor creatures cannot employ counsel—not that they were denied it.

"With us the Kirk Sessions used to inquire into it, in order to the scandal, and to take the confession of the parties, to receive witnesses against them. . . . But, since so much weight is laid upon the depositions there emitted, Kirk Sessions should be very cautious in their procedures" (p. 15).

Apparently proceedings were commenced in the Kirk Sessions; the results were transmitted to the Privy Council, where they were examined by the lawyers, and if deemed sufficient a commission was issued to gentlemen of the vicinage to conduct the trial, summoning an assize to act as a kind of jury.

Mackenzie considers this issuing commissions to be dangerous. It is forbidden in murder cases and should be in witchcraft. The Judges are the only proper judges (p. 15).

He goes on to consider the "relevancy in this crime." Treats of pact and renouncing baptism. Then "the devil's mark useth to be a great article with us." "This mark is discovered among us by a pricker, whose trade it is and who learns it as other trades; but this is a horrid cheat, for they alledge that if the place bleed not, or if the person be not sensible, he or she is infallibly a witch . . . and a villain who used this trade with us, being in the year 1666 apprehended for other villanies, did confess all this trade to be a mere cheat" (p. 17).

Misfortune following after threats he pronounces to be no proof—not "a relevant article" (pp. 17–19).

Delation by other witches—"common bruit and open fame" —is only relevant when conjoined with other evidence.—Ib., p. 23.

He virtually admits that succubi and incubi are possible—the demon forming to himself a body of condensed air—"and upon such a confession as this Margaret Lawder and others were convicted" (p. 25).

"It is likewise possible for the Devil to transport witches

to their public conventions; . . . and sundry witches were in Anno 1665 burned in Culross upon such a confession as this." Goes on to argue out this matter and refers to Can. Episcopi. Admits that it may sometimes be illusory—but this does not exempt from guilt, as it infers preceding pact. From the Can. Episcopi "it is unjustly concluded that there are no real transportations—there being so many instances of these transportations given, both in sacred and profane story, and persons having been found wounded and having really committed murders and other insolencies during these transportations" (pp. 25–6).

Doubts, but does not absolutely deny, that witches can send demons to possess the bodies of others (pp. 26–7).

The devil cannot make one solid body penetrate another. The charge against Margaret Hutchison of entering John Clark's house when doors and windows were shut should not have been admitted to probation (p. 27).

The devil cannot transform—as a witch into a cat—but he can produce the appearance. The ordinary relations may be true of the witch being wounded when the beast was wounded. But it would seem hard to condemn for what seems almost impossible "and I cannot allow instances in the journal books where poor creatures have been burnt upon such confessions, without other strong adminicles" (pp. 28–9).

The devil can make brutes speak—or speak out of them. He can raise tempests and still them—but when Janet Cock was tried for saying to those who were carrying a witch to execution, "Were it not a good sport if the Devil should take her from you," and a great storm arose on the sudden, though it was calm before and after—this charge was not deemed relevant, as it might have proceeded from folly or jest (p. 28).

He can inflict and cure diseases—"a clear instance whereof appears in the marriage-knot" (p. 28).

"Witches may kill by their looks, which looks, being full of venomous spirits, may infect the person upon whom they look." Yet after this positive assertion he debates the question and concludes "that it were hard to fix crimes upon so slender ground." The witch may believe and confess it, yet without other proofs "per se it is hardly relevant" (p. 30).

Love potions doubtful, though "not only witches but even naturalists may give potions that incline men and women to lust." He differentiates love and affection from lust (p. 31).

Witches can torment by figurines, for the devil by natural

means inflicts these torments at the time when the figurine is pierced or burnt. And, as lately at Inverness the witches produced the figurines, "upon a confession so adminiculate witches may very judiciously be found guilty. . . . And if the confession be not fully adminiculate, lawyers advise that confessors be subjected to the torture, which is not usual in Scotland" (pp. 31–2).

This seems strange. Judicial torture may have been growing obsolete by this time, but we have seen above that irregular tortures were administered by zealous gaolers and officials which were equally efficacious in inducing confession.

Proof by witness in this crime is very difficult, and therefore accomplices are admitted, "but though many of them concur, their depositions solely are not esteemed as sufficient." Persons injured by witches are admitted and so are women. Inability to shed tears has been considered a presumption—but it may come from other causes (pp. 33–4).

From some cases referred to it is evident that the assizers were virtually jurymen and those who bore malice or were of kin to parties injured were excluded (p. 34).

The punishment is death "by the foresaid Act of Parliament, to be execute as well against the user as the seeker of any response or consultation *et de practica*. The doom bears, to be worried at the stake and burned" (p. 35).

"With us dumb persons who pretend to foretell future events are never punished capitally. But yet I have seen them tortured, by order from the Council, upon a representation that they were not truly dumb but feigning to be so" (p. 35).

Farinaccius and others think that when no one is injured death should not be inflicted (for consulting fortune-tellers) and that prison and exile are used by all nations. Peregrinus thinks this too favorable except in cases of mere simplicity and *sine dolo malo*. "But with us no such distinction can be allowed by the Justices, who must find all libels relevant which bear consulting with witches and, that ditty being proved, they must condemn the panel to die—albeit I think the Council may alter the punishment if it be clear that the user of these acts (arts?) had no wicked design nor intercourse with the devil therein" (pp. 35–6).

The atmosphere of superstitious dread in which Scotland existed is well exemplified in the case of Sir George Maxwell

of Pollok, a gentleman of distinction, who died in 1677. A curious character who figures in it is Janet Douglas, a young girl who was, or pretended to be, dumb, in consequence of a swelling of the throat, which she subsequently cured, as she said, by the application of *album graecum*, a remedy revealed to her. She had a faculty in regard to witches and witchcraft, for on one occasion at Glasgow she told a woman to bare her arm, and on refusal the sleeve was drawn up and she pointed out a witch-mark. The woman ran home and subsequently asked her neighbors to denounce her, as otherwise the devil would make her kill herself; they endeavored to calm her, but next morning she was found drowned in the Clyde. Janet foretold that she would be scourged through Edinburgh, which came true, for she was imprisoned "for several crimes committed" there, scourged and sent to the plantations. The intervention of this creature in the affair casts a certain amount of doubt over the story, which is related by Sir George himself and by his son Sir John Maxwell, a man who held high office.

Sir George, in Glasgow on the night of October 14, 1676, was suddenly seized with an acute and painful disease, which continued until December, when Janet appeared on the scene and asserted that a woman named Janet Mathie had made a figurine of wax of him and stuck pins in it; that it was in her house in a hole behind the fire and that she would produce it if accompanied by men to protect her. The family disregarded her story, but two of the servants went with her, when she found the figurine in the designated spot. John Maxwell then had Janet Mathie arrested, who declared that the figurine "was the deed of the dumb girl." Sir George thereupon improved somewhat, but on January 4, 1677, he had a relapse and for some days his life was despaired of. On January 7, word came from the dumb girl that John Stewart, Mathie's eldest son, had made four days before a clay figurine of Sir George and that it would be found in his bed-straw. The next day search was made with the dumb-girl, and the image was found in the place designated, John Stewart declaring that he knew nothing about it. He was arrested, as well as his young sister, Annabil Stewart, a child rising thirteen. Sir George thereupon recovered and the pain shortly disappeared.

Annabil Stewart the next day confessed that on January 4, the clay image was made in the house, in the presence of

"the black gentleman" (the devil), John Stewart, Bessie Weir, Margery Craig and Margaret Jackson. John Stewart denied; but, on being examined the next day, plenty of witch-marks were found on him, when he confessed freely his pact with the devil and confirmed his sister's story. A warrant was issued for the arrest of the three women; Margaret Jackson, aged about eighty, confessed fully and many witch-marks were found on her. On January 17, the dumb-girl gave information of another clay image to be found under Janet Mathies's bolster in her Paisley prison—where it was duly discovered, but this was not directed against Sir George. The Privy Council issued commissions to gentlemen of standing to try the three witches who had confessed and the three who were obstinate. They held their first court January 27. Annabil confessed with full details. John Stewart did likewise at much length. Margaret Jackson admitted having given herself to the devil forty years before, and told all about the clay image. Janet Mathie denied and, on January 27, she was placed in the stocks that she might not do violence to her own life. The men who were present at the finding of the effigies gave their concurrent testimony, as also to Sir George's recovery. The confessing witnesses were confronted with the obstinate ones and repeated their statements. The regular "judicious inquest" was held, which condemned them all to be burnt save Annabil, who, on account of her tender years, was imprisoned. She and John earnestly exhorted their mother to confess, reminding her of the many visits of the devil to their house, "but nothing could prevail with her obdured and hardened heart."—The Witches of Renfrewshire, pp. 39–55.

Christian Shaw, aged eleven, daughter of John Shaw, Laird of Bargarran in Renfrewshire, told her mother of one of the maids named Katherine Campbell drinking some milk, who thereupon cursed her. This was on August 17, 1696. On August 21 an old woman named Agnes Naesmith called at the house and asked Christian some questions. On August 22 she was suddenly taken with fits. These continued at intervals and were of the most varied character, described with the utmost minuteness in all detail, resisting alike the drugs of the physicians and the prayers of the ministers. In them she accused Katherine and Agnes and a crew whom she was not allowed to name of being her tormentors. February 2, 1697, John Lindsay in Barloch being in talk with her father

in the hall, she said that one of her tormentors was in the house and on being carried down stairs and on his being made to touch her she was seized with violent pains. That evening an old Highlander applied for a night's lodging and was refused. The girl cried that one of the wicked crew was in or about the house, and on being taken to the kitchen and touched by him she was grievously tormented, whereupon her father had him secured.—Ib., pp. 71–99.

By this time (curious it was not earlier) the Privy Council had been applied to and appointed Lord Blantyre and some gentlemen as a commission. On February 5 they arrested Alexander Anderson, "an ignorant irreligious fellow," and his daughter Elizabeth, accused by Christian. Elizabeth accused her father and also the Highlander as concerned in Christian's troubles. February 5 they met at Bargarran and there were brought before them the parties accused by Elizabeth and Christian, viz., Alexander Anderson, Agnes Naesmith, Margaret Fultoun, James Lindsay *alias* Curat, John Lindsay *alias* Bishop (not yet arrested, but subsequently) and Katherine Campbell. Christian was produced and, on being touched by each of them, was thrown into grievous fits, especially when touched by Katherine Campbell—but, when the latter asked God to bless and save her, the fits passed away and she could be touched by the accused without suffering.—Ib., pp. 99–101.

February 11, a public fast by order of the presbytery, on Christian's account. Three ministers preach about it (p. 103).

February 12, Margaret Lang and her daughter Martha Semple, accused by Christian, voluntarily come to Bargarran House. At first Christian is seized with fits whenever she tries to confirm her accusation, but, when Margaret asks the Lord to bless her, she is relieved and is able to accuse them (p. 105).

February 13, Margaret Roger comes to Bargarran House. She is accused by those who had previously confessed. (There are three who are called the three confessants, but there is nothing in the narrative to indicate who they were. No—James Lindsay is one, p. 118. They are Elizabeth Anderson and James and Thomas Lindsay, p. 131.—H. C. L.) Christian does not seem to accuse her (p. 108).

Her fits continue. About February 24 she accuses J. R. and M. A. of tormenting her (she cannot give full names), who are likewise accused by the three confessants (p. 112).

March 9, in her fits she accuses J. P. (p. 114). March 14

accuses J. K. (p. 115). There is also a gentlewoman, M. M., among her tormentors and a little Highlander (p. 116).

March 19, L. M. appears among her tormentors (p. 116). The gentlewoman (M. M.) is arrested that day. The order had been made out and was to be executed the next day, but at 6 P.M. Christian said that, if she were not arrested that night, it would be useless the next day, as she would make her suffer much between 12 and 1 A.M. (pp. 116–17). At 12:30 her fits suddenly cease; she says the sheriff had entered the gentlewoman's house and she could now go to bed—and this was found to be the case (p. 118).—Ib., pp. 116–18.

M. M. is brought to the house and confronted. When she says, "Lord help thee, poor daft child, and rebuke the Devil," Christian's fits cease. She accuses her of being among the worst of her tormentors (pp. 119–20).

March 22, L. M. (also called J. G.) is brought to the house and confronted. Christian accuses her (p. 121).

M. M. is released on bail and reappears to Christian in her fits as one of her tormentors (p. 123).

Sunday, March 28, Christian through God's mercy recovers, "becoming as well, sensible and composed as ever" (p. 124).

This is the end of the Narrative, printed in 1698 [and reprinted in The Witches of Renfrewshire].

This long-continued affair attracted great attention and there was a constant influx of the principal nobles and gentry at Bargarran House to witness the goings on, as well as ministers who held services and prayers. The trial was likewise attended by all the leading personages of the district (pp. 125–6).

The attestation of Dr. Matthew Brisbane, who attended Christian, speaks of her being, in the intervals of her fits, "so brisk in motion, so florid in colour, so cheerful and, in a word, every way healthful" that she seemed in no need of a physician. He treated her for hypochondria, but in vain, and was forced to the conviction that her trouble was beyond his power (p. 129).

The case being represented to the Privy Council, on January 19, 1697, a warrant was issued to a commission or any five of them "to interrogate and imprison persons suspected of Witchcraft, to examine witnesses, &c., but not upon oath and to transmit their report before the 10th of March, 1697" (Appendix, pp. 130–1).

The "Precognition and Report" of the commission contains the confessions of the three confessants—grandchildren of Jane Fulton. They tell of the devil's visits to Jane Fulton; of meetings of witches and of evil deeds, overturning the ferry-boat of Erskine and drowning the Laird of Brighouse and the ferryman of Erskine; of killing the minister, Mr. Hardy, with a figurine stuck full of pins; of strangling Matthew Park's child and William Montgomerie's child; and of a meeting in Bargarran's orchard where it was resolved to kill Christian Shaw (pp. 131–5).

The commission report that these confessions were made separately and at different times and all accord together, as well as do the facts of the crimes committed. The confessants were confronted with the parties whom they accused as participants. There were twenty-four persons suspected and accused of witchcraft, and further inquiry should be made into this crime (pp. 136–7).

Accordingly a new warrant was issued, April 5, 1697, to a commission composed mostly of the same persons, with some additions, empowering them "or any five of them to meet at Renfrew, Paisley or Glasgow, to take trial of, judge, and do justice upon the foresaid persons; and to sentence the guilty to be burned or otherwise executed to death as the commissioners should incline." Report of proceedings to be made and the Lords of the Treasury recommended to defray the expenses (p. 138).

The commission acted promptly; twenty hours were spent in receiving the testimony for the prosecution. Five of the prisoners confessed and incriminated their associates. (Margaret and Janet Rodger were the other confessants, p. 140.) Counsel on both sides were heard. That for the prosecution warned the jury not to convict the innocent, yet if they should acquit the prisoners in opposition to legal evidence "they would be accessory to all the blasphemies, apostacies, murders, tortures and seductions, whereof these enemies of heaven and earth should hereafter be guilty. The jury deliberated for six hours and condemned seven to be burnt (pp. 138–9).

The records are imperfect and subsequent details are lacking (p. 139).

From the speech of the prosecutor it appears that the accused were pricked, for he says, "it is clearly proven that all the panels have insensible marks and some of them in an extraordinary manner" (p. 150).

He also says that although most sagacious and knowing and perfect in memory "none of them could repeat the Lord's prayer" (p. 163).

After the trial and execution, John Reid, at Inchinnan, not hitherto compromised in this, when on trial for witchcraft, included in his confession joining in the assemblies in Bargarran's yard to encompass Christian's death (p. 177). (He committed suicide in prison and was said to have been strangled by the devil, see Sinclar's "Satan's Invisible World Discovered," Supplement, p. xliv.—H. C. L.)

The seven convicts were executed in Paisley on June 10 (p. 197). There were three men and four women hanged and burnt (p. 205).

Hugo Arnot, who includes this case in his "Celebrated Criminal Trials in Scotland" (1785), treats Christian Shaw as the "Impostor of Bargarran" (p. 201).

In Catholic lands she would have been regarded as possessed of demons; in Scotland she was persecuted by witches. In the case of Gaufredi, Grandier, etc., one man sends demons to possess a community of nuns; here it takes a dozen or two witches to torment one girl. Evidently, young as she was, she was hysterical and, finding that her fits made her conspicuous and an object of compassion, she carried them on with the peculiar ingenuity characteristic of such cases until she had incriminated a lot of beggarly people and one or two of higher station, such as the gentlewoman M. M. and one of the Lindsays, of whom we are told that he had "acquired a considerable fortune by tillage and trade" (p. 175). The ministers naturally took her up and a whole bevy of them were buzzing around her, making the most of the opportunity to impress the people with the power of Satan and the heinous guilt of apostasy.

Christian Shaw, in 1718, married Mr. Miller, minister of Kilmaurs. He died about 1725, when she returned to Bargarran, where she undertook the manufacture of thread, carrying on the whole process with her own hands. The product became known and the demand increased, leading ultimately to a considerable industry in Paisley (pp. 206–7).

The officiousness of the ministers in the matter of witchcraft was merely one of their duties. The General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland in 1640 and again in 1642 ordered all ministers and presbyteries to keep special watch on witches and charmers and to see that they are prosecuted and punished (p. 214).

PART IV.

THE DECLINE OF WITCHCRAFT.

A. WITCHCRAFT AND THE PHILOSOPHERS.

MONTAIGNE.—He treats of witchcraft with his customary *que sais-je*. He does not deny it, but he thinks it easier that men should lie or deceive themselves than that such marvels should be true. After having an opportunity of examining and conversing with a dozen witches on trial and reading their confessions, he concluded that he would prescribe for them hellebore rather than hemlock, and he concludes that to roast a man alive is to ascribe too much weight to one's conjectures.—Essais, l. iii, c. 11.

This was written about 1585. He speaks of two or three years having passed since Gregory XIII reformed the calendar (1582).

GENTILE, ALBERICO.—*Ad Tit. C. de Maleficiis et Math. et ceter. similibus Commentarius.* Hanoviae, 1604. [Date of dedication, 1593.]

Gentile was born in Italy in 1551 and died in London in 1608. He was a Protestant, like his father Matteo—a physician.[1]

He appears to be incredulous—"Quod tamen nec sint ista pocula aut alia incantamenta nisi nugae invalidae, non propterea leges injuste statuunt illis poenas et quidem severissimas" (p. 17).

On the other hand, "Et ego scio daemones ipsos idoneos fuisse et esse qui miracula supra naturam rerum longe maxima edant et edidisse saepius. Sed facere eos isthaec et id scio ex permissu Dei" (p. 52).

Not unjustly are the old women punished whom in Italy we call Strigae, who divine the future with incantations. "At noto casum illum unum esse extra difficultatem si nihil istae egerint mulierculae, quae volitare, cum daemonibus esse [sic], fatentur, ut hae non sint puniendae: sive quia illusum eis sit, sive quod Diaboli facta punire in afflictis istis non magis debeant quam si furiosus daemoniacus peccaverit." But if

[1] Because of the character of his mind, Gentile, though a jurist, is here placed among the philosophers.

they have done something, the question is twofold, as to the most wicked apostates or to the *maleficae*. First, if they deny God and renounce Christ and enslave themselves to the devil, should they not receive the highest punishment? The second case is also twofold, for the *maleficae* may work on others what is called *fascinum*, or kill infants with other poisons, or they are *maleficae* to themselves as those who are said to go to certain nocturnal assemblages where they have intercourse with men and demons. Those are properly put to death who bring death. But this is to be proved—for I have already indicated the vanity of fascination, and yet perhaps it is truer that it is not vanity. Goes on with long discussion of opposing authorities and concludes that if they injure through desire of injuring and not through disease of the (their own) body they are properly punished. So with those who are said to go to the demoniac assemblies, as Bodinus and others hold, though Alciatus and others deny. Even though through illusion they mix the impossible in their confessions, such as passing through cracks to kill children, [yet they should be punished for the other things they confess]. I prefer to follow Bodin, who accumulates reasons, authorities and cases decided. It is disputed, if a witch only makes a compact and does nothing evil; but this is a most atrocious crime—not a mere attempt but consummated apostasy. They add that those who are deceived by the devil should be spared, but the pretext of deception is no excuse for any crime. But if it arises from disease and physicians so decide, they are properly to be removed from the tribunal to a hospital (pp. 54–9).

Bodin says most justly that formerly the clergy judged these cases but now, by edicts, the secular courts in France (p. 79).

Campanella, Tommaso.—*De Sensu Rerum et Magia.* Francofurti, 1620. Printed by the care of his friend Tobias Adami. (The fourth book is "De Magia.")

Fra Tommaso Campanella, born 1568, lay in prison, first in Naples and then in Rome, from July, 1604, to October, 1634—dying in Paris in 1639. He made the Latin translation of his "Senso delle Cose" in his Naples prison, probably in 1609 (Amabile, Fra Tommaso Campanella ne' Castelli di Napoli, etc., (Napoli, 1887), II, pp. 133–148.

His mysticism trending on pantheism led him to ascribe great powers to natural magic when exercised with reverence

to the Creator, elevating the adept to the supernatural and participation with higher beings. Diabolical magic is a fraud, practiced with the aid of demons who pretend to do what they have no power to do; its practitioners, with the aid of demons work what seems wonderful to the unintelligent, but are what jugglers without aid of demons are wont to do at fairs.—De Sensu Rerum et Magia, pp. 260–3.

He who serves God and wishes only what God wishes can change created things miraculously, as a superior commands an inferior. Obedience will not be refused to him who commands in God's name what God wishes, if he has unwavering faith in God, and if he for whom the miracle is wrought also has faith.—Ib., pp. 265–6.

Christ gave the power of working miracles to the Apostles and from them it has descended to us, and those gifted with it can exercise it, even if of evil temperament.—Ib., p. 270.

Diabolical magic emulates and imitates divine, but demons base its operations on natural magic and order stars to be observed and idle ceremonies performed in order to be worshipped.—Ib., p. 281.

He explains the wonders performed by demons by their knowledge of the sympathies and sensibility of things and he explains this with a number of examples which illustrate the credulity of the age. Thus, if a drum is made of a wolf's skin and another of the skin of a sheep, especially of one that has been frightened by a wolf, if the wolf-skin one is beaten, the other will tear itself apart. If a man has a swollen spleen and will take the spleen of an animal and hang it in the smoke of a chimney, as it dries up and shrivels, so will his swelling subside. He adduces, without vouching for it, the common belief that a wound can be cured by anointing the sword that inflicted it.—Ib., pp. 299–302.

In this way he explains the vulgar magic of exciting hatred or love.—Ib., pp. 319, 322–5.

Also the evil eye.—Ib., pp. 326–7.

He does not know demons can be rendered visible, when they are incorporeal, as theologians teach, or of a most subtile nature, as S. Augustin and many of the fathers say, since our eyes can see nothing that is not thicker than air. Others say that they can be felt, as S. Bernard and innumerable witnesses, which cannot be doubted, though we cannot understand how they are said to assume a body of condensed air, for we do not know that it can be condensed without being

converted into water. Who knows whether they assume another human body or that of a beast or satyr? Nor can we conceive how they can raise the winds and rains and seas, unless they are active like fire; or that they have hands and similar organs to stir up, or that created things obey them as God, which is impossible, for things have their powers and senses not from them but from God. But they, unembarrassed by bodies, understand the higher forces, activities and possibilities of natural things and use them as far as God permits, and innumerable experiences and most weighty authorities prove that they can perform such wonders, and we also can perform wonders.—Ib., p. 332.

There is great doubt whether witches go corporeally with demons and have intercourse with them. S. Augustin thinks that they are anointed and fall into stupor and think they are carried by the demon, which may be. But many experiences teach that they go in the body and external sense and see many things by the demons; but how they go and return through closed doors unless opened by the devil I do not understand. Perhaps they go in their sleep, like many somnambulists, do many things and return to their beds. They say they are led around by the spirit—perhaps so. It is doubted whether the demon can transform bodies, but I think not save in imagination. If a dog substituted by the demon in the matter of which the witch dreams is wounded, the demon similarly wounds her in bed so that she may be believed to have walked in that figure. Many things happen through the cunning attributed to demons and angels. Fr. Rocco told me that in Friuli he observed a monk who went every night to pray to a wooden image of St. Dominic. He dressed himself like the saint, with a discipline, removed the image and took its place. When the monk came, Rocco raised the discipline and the monk was frightened; Rocco moved and he ran away. Rocco followed and he fell senseless. Rocco replaced the statue, called other monks and raised him; his hair had become white, he could not speak and he died in a few days speechless. The same happened in Praecanica to a slave frightened by another slave. It is therefore most necessary to distinguish the true from the false and to understand the power of the impulses by which every one does what is imagined.—Ib., pp. 333–4.

This is a somewhat curious compromise, apparently to cover disbelief, for it makes concessions incompatible with his previous definitions of demons and their powers.

He fully believes in the effect of figurines, through the operation of the demon, but he explains it by sympathy and relates various cases in which such sympathy operated without the aid of sorcery.—Ib., pp. 341–2.

Is full believer in astrology. Says that when young he was opposed to it and wrote against it, but has been taught by bitter experience.—Ib., p. 357.

It is worth noting in Campanella and in Prierias and Spina what implicit faith seems to be reposed in the fables of classical antiquity and how the legends and marvels of the poets and the superstitions of the people are accepted and adduced in support of current beliefs, the ancient gods being regarded as demons and their myths being used as proofs.

Bacon, Francis.—Whatever may have been Bacon's official opinion in the enforcement of the law, as a philosopher he was less credulous and required proof before he would yield assent. Thus he says that men are not rashly to take that for done which is not done. "And therefore, as divers wise judges have prescribed and cautioned, men may not too rashly believe the confessions of witches, nor yet the evidence against them. For the witches themselves are imaginative and believe oft-times they do that which they do not: and people are credulous in that point and ready to impute accidents and natural operations to witchcraft. It is worthy the observing, that both in ancient and late times, as in the Thessalian witches and the meetings of witches that have been recorded by so many late confessions, the great wonders which they tell, of carrying in the air, transforming themselves into other bodies, etc., are still reported to be wrought, not by incantations or ceremonies, but by ointments and anointing themselves all over. This may justly move a man to think that these fables are the effects of imagination: for it is certain that ointments do all, if they be laid on anything thick, by stopping of the pores shut in the vapours and send them to the head extremely."—Bacon, Sylva Sylvarum, cent. x, n. 903 (Works, pub. Phila., 1841, p. 125).

Yet he was by no means ready to reject all witchcraft as "fables." In treating of the power of imagination upon other bodies he alludes to witchcraft as a fact upon which to reason—"as if a witch by imagination should hurt any afar off, it cannot be naturally; but by working upon the spirit of some that cometh to the witch; and from that party upon the imagination of another; and so upon another; till it come to one that hath resort to the party intended; and so by him to the party intended himself." But "the experi-

ments of witchcraft are no clear proofs (of the power of imagination) for that they may be by the tacit operation of malign spirits."—Ib., n. 950 (p. 131).

"The ointment that witches use is reported to be made of the fat of children digged out of their graves; of the juices of smallage, wolf-bane and cinque-foil, mingled with the meal of fine wheat. But I suppose that the soporiferous medicines are likest to do it; which are henbane, hemlock, mandrake, moonshade, tobacco, opium, saffron, poplar leaves, etc."—Ib., n. 975.

There is much in this "Century" to show that Bacon was not superior to all the superstitions of his day, practical though he was in his demand for proofs. Bacon died in 1626 and this work was published posthumously by his chaplain, Dr. Rawley, in 1627.

The declination from religion, besides the privative, which is atheism, and the branches thereof, are three; heresies, idolatry, and witchcraft . . . witchcraft, when we adore false gods, knowing them to be wicked and false; for so your Majesty doth excellently well observe that witchcraft is the height of idolatry.—Adv. of Learning, bk. ii (Works, I, p. 266).

In his charge to the "Court of the Verge," of which he was one of the judges, directing the subjects of inquiry he says: "For witchcraft, by the former law it was not death, except it were the actual and gross invocation of evil spirits, or making covenant with them, or taking away life by witchcraft; but now, by an act in his majesty's times, charms and sorceries in certain cases of procuring of unlawful love, or bodily hurt, and some others, are made felony the second offence; the first being imprisonment and pillory" (Works, II, p. 291).

Helmont, Jan Baptista van.—In spite of a savor of charlatanism, Van Helmont (†1644) had a European reputation as a physician and his works, translated into various languages, were reprinted throughout the rest of the century. He explains the things introduced into the human body by witchcraft as spiritual portents worked with the assistance of Satan. He divides into three classes the patrons of Satan—first, those who deny the existence of Satan and his works; second, those who believe in demons but say they are not enemies of man and that the crimes of witches are fallacious fables and hypochondriacal inventions; third, those who under the authority of Scripture admit diabolical doings but say these are mere arts which are condemned only because framed by Satan for evil. The devil cannot assume forms, but has

power to move bodies, not by taking hold, as he has no extremities, but by will. He is unable to act himself and requires a human intermediary, for which purpose he excites desire or hatred in the witch.—Cited in Romanus, De Existentia Spectrorum, Magorum et Sagarum (Jena, 1744), p. 75.

Descartes, René.—Descartes, who, from his materialistic point of view, explained dreams by the condition of the brain acting through the pineal gland, was not likely to give much credence to the activities of demons. He points out, moreover, how much stronger are the impressions made on the imagination by external influences in sleep than when awake.—Tractatus de Homine, P. V, n. 102.

It is a common error to believe that the soul is the source of natural heat and motion because the corpse is cold and motionless. "Cum e contrario cogitandum potius fuisset animam cum morimur non discedere nisi quia ille calor cessat et organa quae inserviunt motibus corporis corrumpuntur."—Tract. de Passionibus Animae, P. I, art. 5.

Death does not occur by fault of the soul, but because some principal part of the body is corrupted, as a clock ceases to move when its works are broken.—Ib., art. 6.

There would seem to be a distinct denial of sorcery, when, treating of imaginations, he begins "Cum anima nostra sese applicat ad imaginandum aliquid quod non est, V. G. in concipienda Basilica quadam, Magica aut Chimaera."—Ib., art. 20. (Query, if here Basilica ought to be "Basilisco quodam"?—H. C. L.)

"Tales sunt illusiones nostrorum somniorum et phantasiae quae nobis vigilantibus accidunt, cum cogitatio nostra negligenter vagatur, nulli rei sese addicens."—Ib., art. 21.

"Sic saepe cum dormimus, imo quandoque vigilantes, nobis tam vehementur imaginamur quaedam ut putemus ea coram videre aut sentire in nostro corpore quamvis ei nullo modo insint."—Ib., art. 26.

Although the soul is united to all parts of the body, still its principal seat is the pineal gland, where it immediately exercises its functions.—Ib., art. 32.

Descartes' materialism is exhibited in the observation, after defining the various passions, "Earum vero causa non est, ut Admirationis, in solo cerebro, sed etiam in corde, in liene, in jecore, et in omnibus aliis partibus corporis, quatenus inserviunt productioni sanguinis et deinde spirituum."—Ib., P. II, art. 96.

Thence he proceeds to describe the various corporeal conditions accompanying the different passions.—Ib., art. 97–111.

There is no such thing as the Fortune which people believe in. "Et sciendum omnia dirigi a Providentia divina, cujus decretum aeternum adeo infallibile et immutabile est ut exceptis iis quae idem Decretum voluit pendere ex nostro arbitrio, cogitare oporteat respectu nostri nihil evenire quod necessarium non sit et quadantenus fatale, adeo ut absque errore cupere non possimus ut aliter eveniat."—Ib., art. 146.

Descartes' materialistic philosophy affords no place for the agency of evil spirits. Apparently he prudently avoids special denial and contents himself with ignoring them and their works as unworthy of discussion.

Hobbes, Thomas.—Hobbes argues away the existence of spirits—whether angels or demons. In Scripture men are sometimes called angels or messengers of God. Otherwise what are termed angels are dreams or visions whereby God makes his will known to men. The Gentiles conceived the imagery of the brain to be real things, independent of the fancy and out of them framed demons good and evil. Similarly the Jews thought the apparitions which God produced in the fancies of men to be substances and permanent creatures of God; those which were good they called angels of God and those they thought would hurt them they termed evil angels or evil spirits, such as the spirits of madmen and epileptics, "for they esteemed such as were troubled with such diseases, *Demoniaques*."

All this seems clear enough, but when he considers and explains the texts in which good and evil angels are named, he modifies his views somewhat and his conclusion is: "Considering therefore the signification of the word Angel in the Old Testament, and the nature of Dreams and Visions that happen to men by the ordinary way of Nature; I was inclined to this opinion, that Angels were nothing but supernatural apparitions of the Fancy, raised by the speciall and extraordinary operation of God, thereby to make his presence and commandements known to mankind and chiefly to his own people. But the many places of the New Testament, and our Saviour's own words, and in such texts wherein there is no suspicion of corruption of the Scripture, have extorted from my feeble Reason an acknowledgment and belief that there be also Angels substantiall and permanent."—Leviathan, c. 34 (ed. 1651), pp. 211–14.

That is, in short, that the angels of the Old Testament are passing visions sent by God. Those, both good and evil, of the New Testament are corporeal permanent bodies and not spirits.

Hobbes does not seem to be in any way an infidel or even a Deist. He says (c. 44, p. 334), "The Darkest part of the Kingdom of Satan is that which is without the Church of God; that is to say, amongst them that believe not in Jesus Christ." (But he takes no stock in demons.—H. C. L.) "The Enemy has been here in the Night of our Natural Ignorance and sown the tares of Spiritual Errors. . . . Secondly by introducing the Daemonology of the Heathen Poets, that is to say, their fabulous Doctrine concerning Demons, which are but Idols or Phantasmes of the brain, without any real nature of their own, distinct from humane fancy; such as are dead men's Ghosts and Fairies and other matter of old Wives' tales."—Ib., c. 44 (p. 334).

It is easy to understand the abhorrence held for Hobbes by Catholic writers in view of the way in which he treats the popes' pretensions to be the Vicar of Christ, superior to the temporal powers, and of the clergy as a class independent of the secular authority and their demand for tithes—in his argument that the Church is not the kingdom of God, which is not to be on the earth until the second advent of Christ (ib., pp. 335–6).

So the consecration of the Host is only a conjuration or incantation.—Ib., p. 337.

He is impartial in classing the Presbytery with the papacy. —Ib., p. 341.

He is a true disciple of Marsiglio of Padua, setting the State above the Church.

In making reference to Hobbes, I should think it best not to allude to his contradictory utterances concerning angels, but only to cite the above very decided denial of the existence of demons.

The contrast between the thirteenth century and the seventeenth can scarce be more forcibly marked than by the comparison between the Satan of Dante and of Milton:

> To whom the Tempter, inly racked, replied:
> "Let that come when it comes; all hope is lost
> Of my reception into grace: what worse?
> For where no hope is left, is left no fear:
> If there be worse, the expectation more
> Of worse torments me than the feeling can.
> I would be at the worst: worst is my part,
> My harbour and my ultimate repose;
> The end I would attain, my final good."—
>
> Paradise Regained, Bk. 3.

Milton adopts the theory of Satan entering the serpent:

> The Devil entered; and his brutal sense,
> In heart or head, possessing, soon inspired
> With act intelligential; but his sleep
> Disturbed not, waiting close th' approach of morn.—
> Paradise Lost, Bk. 9.

MALEBRANCHE.—The Oratorian Père Nicholas Malebranche enjoyed the highest reputation in his day as a Christian philosopher. His *Recherche de la Verité* appeared in 1673.

I have not access to the original, but refer to the English translation of T. Taylor, "Treatise concerning the Search after Truth," 2. ed., London, 1700.

Malebranche had too sincere a reverence for Scripture and the received traditions of the Church to question the existence and power of demons. He says, "We know the Devils sometimes transform themselves into Angels of Light."—Recherche, l. ii, pt. III, c. 2 (p. 90).

His views on the subject of witchcraft are set forth at length in l. ii, pt. III, c. 6.

"The strangest effect of the force of Imagination, is the immoderate Fear of the Apparition of Spirits, Witchcraft, Spells and Charms, *Lycanthropes* or *Wolf-men*, and generally of whatever is suppos'd to depend upon the Power of the Devil" (p. 99).

"And so we need not wonder that *Sorcerers* and *Witches* are so common in some Countries, where the belief of the *Witches-Sabbath* is deeply rooted in the Mind: Where all the most extravagant relations of *Witchcrafts* are listen'd to as Authentic Histories; and where Madmen and *Visionists*, whose Imagination has been distemper'd through the recital of these Stories, and the Corruption of their Hearts, are burnt for real *Sorcerers* and *Witches*" (p. 99).

He proceeds to describe how the tales of parents impress children; how persons hearing of these things anoint themselves and in their sleep imagine themselves at the Sabbat; how mutual communications of these adventures strengthen the belief and a connected system is built up.

"Thus in places where *Witches* are burnt we find great numbers of them, it being taken for granted they are really what they were executed for; and this belief is strengthened by the Discourses that are made of them. Should they cease to punish them, and treat them as Mad-folks, we should see

in a little time no more *Witches*; because those that are only imaginarily so, which certainly make the greatest number, would return to sober Sense again" (p. 100).

"'Tis certain that *True Witches* deserve death, and that the *Imaginary* are not to be reputed altogether innocent: For generally they never fancy themselves to be *Witches* without having their Heart dispos'd to go to the *Sabbath*, and anointing their Bodies with some Drug, to bring about their wicked Design: But by punishing all these Criminals without distinction, the common Perswasion gathers strength, the *Imaginary Witches* daily multiply, and a great many people destroy their lives and souls together." (But he suggests no criterion to distinguish the imaginary from the true.—H. C. L.) "Wherefore 'tis not without Reason, several of our Courts have left off punishing them; since which, there are found but few that are within their Jurisdiction; and the Envy, Hatred, and Malice of the wicked, cannot use that pretence to the Destruction of the Innocent" (p. 100).

He applies the same line of reasoning to the loups-garoux.

"Though I am satisfy'd that real *Witches* are extreamly rare and that their *Sabbath* is nothing but a Dream; and that the Courts which throw out the Indictments of *Witchcraft* are the most equitable; yet I know not but there may be *Sorcerers*, *Charms*, and *Witchcraft*, and that God sometimes permits the *Devil* to exercise his Malice upon Men. But we are taught by holy Scripture, that the *Kingdom of Satan is destroyed*; and that an *Angel of Heaven* has *chain'd up the Devil*, and shut him in the *Abyss*, from whence he shall never escape till the end of the World" (pp. 100–01).

He does not pretend to reconcile this contradiction, though he alludes again to God's permission.

Constrained by the traditions and teaching of the Church, Malebranche makes sufficient admissions to neutralize his arguments with those who believe and act on their belief. His only absolute assertion is his denial of the Sabbat. He has not advanced beyond the position of Ulric Molitoris, except that he would punish imaginary witches more lightly.

Spinoza.—In his correspondence in 1674 with a friend who argued the existence of spirits, Spinoza denies wholly their existence or the necessity of any intermediate beings between God and man, and he rejects as old wives' fables, unworthy of investigation, the stories of their appearance and doings. The manner in which he disposes of his correspondent's arguments is a beautiful example of clear, incisive thinking.—Epp. 56, 58, 60 (Opp., Lipsiae, 1844, II, pp. 305–21).

In his final letter he sums up the result of the debate—"Tuam coniecturam de spectris et lemuribus falsam et ne verisimilem quidem videri, tam clare ostendi, ut in responso tuo nihil animadversione dignum inveniam." When his correspondent asks whether he can form as clear an idea of God as of a triangle, he answers in the affirmative, but that he cannot form as clear an image of him, and adds, "Deum enim non imaginari, sed quidem intelligere possumus," which shows clearly that he was not an infidel.—Ep. 60 (p. 320).

Spinoza points out the absurdity of the rôle assigned to Satan—"At dicunt eum [Adam] a diabolo deceptum fuisse. Verum quis ille fuit qui ipsum diabolum decepit? Quis, inquam, ipsum omnium creaturarum intelligentium praestantissimum adeo amentem reddidit ut Deo maior esse voluerit? Nonne enim se ipsum, qui mentem sanam habebat, suumque esse, quantum in se erat, conservare conabatur?"—Tractatus Politicus, c. 2, n. 6 (II, p. 56).

He also assumes the non-existence of demons when he argues that Christ was only condescending to the popular superstitions when he assumed their existence, as in Matt., xii, 26,—"Nihil nisi Pharisaeos ex suis principiis convincere voluit, non autem docere, dari daemones aut aliquod daemonum regnum." So when, Matt., xviii, 10, he spoke of the angels of children in heaven, "nihil aliud docere vult quam ne sint superbi, et ne aliquem contemnant, non vero aliqua quae in ipsius rationibus, quas tantum adfert ad rem discipulis melius persuadendum, continentur."—Tractatus Theologico-Politicus, c. 2, n. 56 (III, p. 47).

Locke, John.—The widespread influence of Locke on the intelligence of his time renders it desirable that he should have expressed in definite terms his opinions on witchcraft, but he seems not to have felt himself called upon to do so. What those opinions were, however, can be plainly deduced from his attitude towards spirits.—"But between us and the great God we can have no certain knowledge of the existence of any Spirits but by revelation; much less have we distinct *Ideas* of their different Natures, Conditions, States, Powers and several Constitutions wherein they agree or differ from one another and from us. And therefore in what concerns their different Species and Properties we are under an absolute ignorance."—Locke, An Essay concerning Humane Understanding, bk. iv, c. 3, §27 (ed. 1690, p. 279).

What he thought of the authority of revelation may be gathered from c. 18 of bk. iv and c. 19, §9 [c. 20, §9 of modern editions].

Romanus, De Existentia Spectrorum, etc. (p. 78) gives a more direct quotation from bk. ii, c. 32 [c. 33], §10, but in my edition (1690) bk. ii ends with c. 31. There may have been additions to a later edition.

When thus all the labors of theologians and demonologists were thus contemptuously cast aside into the limbo of the unknowable, there was nothing left on which to build the superstitions that had so long afflicted humanity.

Leibnitz.—Considering the preëminent position of Leibnitz (†1716), it is remarkable that in this crisis of the controversy respecting witchcraft his name never appears and neither side cites his name in support. That so many-sided a man should have taken no interest in the matter would seem incredible and yet he appears to have kept himself wholly aloof. How little respect he felt for venerable beliefs and superstitions is evident from his treating the story of Balaam and his ass as a dream or vision (see his Histoire de Bileam in Essais de Theodicée, ed. 1734, I, p. 240), but perhaps he considered the questions involved in witchcraft as unworthy the attention of a philosopher who regarded the earth as a mere point in space and its evil as infinitely little in comparison with the goodness which may predominate in the millions of other suns and planets (Theodicée, §19, I, pp. 85–7).

As the Archbishop Elector of Mainz, Spee's friend, was Leibnitz's early patron his disbelief in sorcery may be taken for granted; this is further manifested by Leibnitz in his exalted opinion of Father Spee and of the influence of the Cautio Criminalis, which he thus sets forth: "J'ai appris du grand Electeur de Mayence, Jean Philippe de Schönborn, . . . que ce Père s'etant trouvé en Franconie, lorsqu'on y faisoit rage pour brûler des Sorciers prétendus, et en ayant accompagné plusieurs jusq'au bucher, qu'il avoit reconnu tous innocens par les confessions et par les recherches qu'il en avoit faites, en fut si touché que, malgré le danger qu'il y avoit alors de dire la verité, il se résolut à composer cet Ouvrage (sans s'y nommer pourtant), qui a fait un grand fruit, et qui a converti sur ce chapitre cet Electeur, encore simple Chanoine alors, et depuis Evêque de Wurzbourg, et enfin aussi Archevêque de Mayence; lequel fit cesser ces brûleries aussitôt qu'il parvint à la Regence. En quoi il a été suivi par les Ducs de Brunswic et enfin par la plûpart des autres Princes et Etats d'Allemagne."—Theodicée, §97 (I, pp. 144–5).

This indicates sufficiently his disbelief in witchcraft and further that he took no part in the struggle against it. When he says, in 1714, that most

of the German princes had abrogated its punishment, the exaggeration shows that he had paid little attention to the vicissitudes of the contest.

In the perpetual digressions and quotations through which Leibnitz makes ostentatious display of his learning, it is not easy to determine what are his own real opinions, but he apparently accepts the orthodox opinion of his day as to the devil and his angels.

He says: "La première méchanceté nous est connue, c'est celle du Diable et de ses anges: le Diable peche dès le commencement. . . . (I Jean, iii, 8) Le Diable est le père de la méchanceté, meurtrier dès le commencement et n'a point perseveré dans la vérité. Jean viii, 44. Et pour cela, Dieu n'a point épargné les Anges qui ont peché, mais les ayant abimés avec des chaines d'obscurité, il les a livrés pour être reservés pour le jugement (II Pierre, ii, 4)."—Ib., §273 (II, pp. 154–5).

It would seem that the author of the Apocalypse wished to make clear what the other writers left obscure, for he narrates a battle in heaven where Michael and his angels fought against the Dragon and his angels (Apoc., xii, 7–9).—Ib., §274.

But he has no hesitation in asserting that it was the devil who tempted Adam and Eve—"Il en est de même d'Eve et d'Adam; ils ont peché librement, quoique le Diable les ait seduits."—Ib., p. 275.

Bayle, Pierre.—Bayle (1647–1706) discusses at length the subject of sorcery and witchcraft in his *Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial.* Its date is 1703 (Soldan-Heppe, II, p. 243). Chapters 34 to 45 are printed in the original by Meinders in his Gedancken und Monita (Lemgo, 1716), pp. 12–93, from which I quote.

He says, "Vous savez qu'en plusieurs Provinces de France, en Savoie, dans le Canton de Berne, et en plusieurs autres endroits de l'Europe, on ne parle que de sorceleries, et qu'il n'y a si petit bourg ni hameau où quelqu'un ne soit reputé sorcier. . . . Vous n'entendez autre chose parmi le petit peuple sinon qu'une maladie a été donnée à tels et à tels par un sorcier, et qu'elle a été guerie ou par le même sorcier ou par un de ses confrères." Goes on to ascribe to the force of imagination both the sickness and the cure.—Réponse, c. 34 (Meinders, pp. 16–17).

There was a general belief that if the knot was untied the husband was relieved of his impotence and also that when such a knot was untied there would be a fall of hail. Bayle tells two stories, the truth of one of which he vouches for,

when a hailstorm led the husband to believe that the charm was lifted and he at once recovered his virility.—Ib., p. 21.

Quotes from Dr. Venette of La Rochelle, who when young, being displeased with a workman of his father's, threatened in joke to ligature him on his approaching marriage. The mere threat sufficed to work its own fulfilment and no assurances that nothing had been done removed the impediment. Finally, after three weeks labor, the priest who had married him succeeded in removing his impotence.—Ib., p. 22.

Bayle admits the reality of sorcery and deems it worthy of death—"S'ils sont de veritables sorciers, c'est-à-dire s'ils ont fait réellement un pacte avec le Demon pour se donner à lui et pour stipuler qu'il emploiera sa puissance à satisfaire leurs passions, ils sont dignes *ipso facto* du dernier supplice, car il n'y a point de mechanceté qui soit égale à la leur. Ils savent que le Demon est la plus maudite de toutes les creatures, qu'il est l'ennemi de Dieu et du genre humain, et ils lui consacrent leur corps et leur ame. . . . Ils renonçent volontairement et sciemment au service du vrai Dieu et s'enrolent dans le service du plus mechant de tous les êtres qu'ils reconnoissent pour tel."—Ib., c. 35 (p. 25).

"Quant aux sorciers imaginaires, je veux dire ceux qui n'aiant point contracté effectivement avec le Diable, croient neanmoins avoir traité avec lui, je les trouve aussi coupables et aussi punissables que les vrais sorciers."—Ibidem.

There would be some difference with those who have dreamed that they attended the Sabbat without having rubbed themselves with the drug which is said to be used, provided on waking they detest it and endeavor seriously to prevent its repetition. But if they are pleased with it, take it to be real, desire its recurrence and observe the preparatory ceremonies for the voyage, they are as criminal as a sorcerer and deserve the penalty of sorcerers.—Ib., p. 26.

He disagrees with Bekker, who condemns judges who punish sorcerers. The private belief of a judge should have no influence on his duties as judge.—Ib., p. 27.

As sorcerers enter into engagement with Satan to do all the evil they can, they devote themselves to injuring their neighbors. "Voilà donc des pestes publiques qu'il semble que l'on ne sauroit exterminer trop promptement; le bien de la société, repos des particuliers le demandent."—Ib., p. 29.

Apparently he treats the Sabbat as an affair of the imagination.—Ib., c. 36 (p. 48); c. 39 (p. 63).

When he comes to consider the practical question of persecution and punishment he takes a different ground from that above. He quotes Malebranche and agrees with him. "On y fait perir beaucoup d'innocens, et par le suplice même des coupables on fortifie la credulité populaire, qui est la source du desordre." If their operations were laughed at and this unbelief were established in a province, twenty years would put an end to the credit of the sorcerers. In Holland there is no belief in sorcery, with the result that there no one is suspected of frequenting the Sabbat . . . where it is imagined that the devil is adored and that all kinds of impurity are practised by incubi and succubi with women and men. The experience of centuries proves that punishment of sorcerers does not diminish their number and that credulity with its deplorable results increases in proportion to the number of prosecutions. It is doubtless from this consideration that the Parlement of Paris discharges all sorcerers not convicted of poisoning and who confess only to frequenting the Sabbat.—Ib., p. 63.

"Mais . . . c'est un assez grand crime que de vouloir y aller et que de s'y preparer par les onguens qu'elles croient necessaires à cette horrible expedition . . . François Hotman consulté sur cette question repondit qu'elles meritoient la mort. Thomas Erastus a soutenu la même chose, et c'est là le sentiment le plus ordinaire des Jurisconsultes et des Casuistes, soit Catholiques, soit Protestans."—Ib., p. 64.

Anyhow, it is not to be denied that great abuses prevail in these prosecutions, so that, if rulers do not choose to forbid prosecution, they should at least frame a new code and confine them to enlightenened and impartial judges, abolishing various kinds of proof which are not in any way convincing and are well adapted to oppress innocence. Moreover, if possible, a stop should be put to the greed for confiscations and a hundred other abuses introduced by the malice of prosecutors and the ignorance, the prejudice and the cupidity of judges.—Ib., pp. 64–5.

In spite of his mocking scepticism, Bayle does not absolutely deny the existence of sorcery. He says it is asserted that there are magicians who coerce the demons whom they evoke. Absurd as this may seem, it may be considered possible if we admit that there are certain pacts between men and the evil angels, for without doubt there is subordination among these spirits and there may be demons who

reign absolutely over others. Could not one of these demons promise his magicians to submit to them all his subordinates and threaten with his anger those who were recalcitrant?—Bayle, Dictionnaire Historique, s. v., Tiresias, note 1.

Thus without committing himself he shows readiness of belief and leaves the matter in suspense.

For learned men accused of sorcery see Torreblanca, De Magia, l. ii, c. 5, nn. 32 sqq. Also Goldast, Rechtliches Bedencken, pp. 72–4. Goldast relates (*loc. cit.*) concerning Dr. Leonhard Thurneyser of Basel, who was thus accused, that in 1591 his schoolmaster David Lang told him that Thurneyser's wife gave as a reason for desiring separation that his heart went about with the devil and that she often saw in his chamber strange and unknown persons, although no one had entered the house.

B. WITCHCRAFT AND THE MORAL THEOLOGIANS.

Sayre, Gregory.—*Clavis Regia Sacerdotum Casuum Conscientiae.* 4. ed., Venetiis, 1615.

Gregory Sayre was an English Benedictine, compelled to leave England. That his work went rapidly to a fourth edition shows that it possessed authority and in fact it is frequently quoted by subsequent writers. There were editions, Venetiis, 1605, 1607 and 1613. He died in Venice in 1602 at the age of thirty-two, after writing various other works, of which Ziegelbauer says, "Haec Sayri opera ingentis semper auctoritatis apud omnes theologos et canonum professores fuisse, mirum non est." (Hurter, Nomenclator Literarius, III, 601–2.)

Sayre quotes from Caietano that demons frequently appear in assumed human bodies to the waking, talk familiarly with them and lie with them. "Non enim habent veras carnes, ossa vera nec membra, sed carnis et membrorum similitudinem non solum visibilem sed etiam palpabilem et solidam, ita ut sentiantur tanquam humanae personae, prout refert Caietanus se a personis fide dignis ex propria experientia narrantibus audivisse." Caietanus adds correctly that he learned from the same persons that these demons in human shape have not real flesh, which is certain, for their touch is unpleasant, being as cold as ice, and they confess they cannot help it. Also this is shown "ex delectatione tactus et concubitus. Est enim tanto personarum humanarum commistio

naturalis delectabilior quanto verum super excedit verisimili." —Sayre, l. iv, c. 5, n. 6 (pp. 235–6).

The demon can also cause illusions, causing appearances which delude, either by corporeal alteration or by unctions, as Caietano says occurs with those who believe themselves on Thursday nights to be carried *ad ludos Dianae*, of which Caietano gives various examples. And he goes on to quote Cap. Episcopi, which he credits to St. Augustin.—Ibidem.

"Maleficii autem nomine intelligitur, hoc in loco, illud solum maleficium, quod a diabolo per hominem, vel instante homine infertur, mediante aliquo signo pacti expressi vel taciti, quod est inter maleficum et diabolum, quod signum etiam maleficium dicitur, ut infixio gladii intra circulum, plumarum involutio, imago caerea cum acubus infixis et hujusmodi."—Ib., c. 6, n. 9 (p. 244).

There are some who deny all this, saying that what are regarded as works of the demon are performed by natural causes, which some may know and produce the effects attributed to demons. But Exod. xxii and the civil law show that there are *malefici*, and reason indicates that all these things cannot be done naturally but only by demons.—Ibidem.

Thus human power cannot reach the clouds and cause tempest, but a broom dipped in water and shaken in the air will immediately cause rain, which can only be effected through demons. So needles thrust into a waxen image will cause torture in the same parts of the person who is the object, which can only be work of the demon. So witches are transported through the air and cause others, even against their will, to be transported to distant places, and penetrate through closed doors and windows and depart, leaving them closed. So a virgin girl will see in a bowl of water or in a finger nail all the details of a theft unknown to her and to the sorcerer. So stones and wood and brutes are made to speak and reveal hidden things unknown to men—all of which are manifestly the work of demons and not of natural causes.—Ib., nn. 10–12.

There are some canonists who doubt the transport of bodies, relying on the Cap. Episcopi. There may sometimes be illusions, as stated above, but there can be no doubt that sometimes women are really transported by demons, for it is an experience proved by judges, especially in Germany—for which he quotes the Malleus and a cloud of later writers. The canon does not deny that this may sometimes occur,

but only asserts it to be fabulous that it occurs in the way there described with Diana and Herodias and that the latter are goddesses.—Ib., n. 13 (p. 245).

So many almost incredible things are related of these *malefici* that some who are unable to account for them believe them to be false and fabulous. It is therefore worth while to explain them, so that they may be believed and *malefici* be more cautiously shunned. Proceeds to show from Aquinas the great knowledge and power of demons. Thus, although they cannot move the earth or other element, for this would be to subvert the order of Nature, they can overthrow mountains and carry bodies from earth to heaven in an instant. So, when God permits, they can transport people, cause tempests, pestilence, condense the air into figures and color them so as to represent men and women and beasts and the like.—Ib., n. 14.

Nor is their malice less than their cunning and from hatred of the human race they use every means to deceive and destroy those who apply to them, and although, when God permits, they can do this of themselves, they desire to have abandoned men as coöperators. When invoked they sometimes come and sometimes do not, and when they come they sometimes do not do what they are accustomed to do, but make it seem a figment, and this when they fear their *maleficia* will be detected and sorcerers be prosecuted and they make it all seem to be dreams and fictitious, so that sorcerers may work with impunity. From this it is easy to understand the way in which *maleficia* are done and why they serve men and women as succubi and incubi.—Ib., n. 17 (p. 246).

In the same way witches and sorcerers are transformed into beasts—which, although sometimes this is illusory and only in imagination, yet it sometimes is real, for many have been wounded in the form of cats and have been found wounded in the same places and have confessed, as in Mall. Malef., ii, 1, 9. They (the demons) can also transform others into beasts and make them bear burdens—not that they are really transformed, but, by condensing air, they are enveloped in the forms of beasts, and to complete the illusion the demons give them appropriate voices and cries and support them in the air so that they fly like birds and open windows so that as cats they enter rooms, and with condensed air they make it appear that members are cut off, when they really are not, and afterwards restored. (Explanation of the stories in the

Malleus.) And the demons can assume the form of animals, as of a serpent in the temptation of Eve.—Ib., n. 18.

As for the wonderful way in which the bewitched vomit needles, nails, hair, great bones, feathers rolled up and the like, so that it seems impossible that things so large should pass through the mouth and even through the eyes, it is easily understood from the above, for they are either illusions produced by condensed air, or they are real objects which the demon introduces invisibly into the stomach and then ejects visibly, comminuting and reuniting the things too large for passage so rapidly as to deceive the eye.—Ib., n. 19 (pp. 246–7).

This explains how the demons excite tempests, cause pestilence and sterility and cures, and cause love or hatred between spouses, how old women cure infirmities and by sticking needles in an image torture a distant person—for the demon knows what will cause these effects and applies them on the instant.—Ib., n. 20 (p. 247).

Their knowledge of the past and present and of what goes on at a distance enables them to predict much of the future.—Ib., n. 21.

God permits to the demon especial power over the generative act because through it original sin is transmitted. He describes at length five means by which this is done and relates the story of St. Basil (which I have elsewhere—H. C. L.).—Ib., n. 22.

From this may be gathered what *maleficium* really is: "Est enim opus excedens communem captum et facultatem hominum, diaboli opera et libero voluntatis humanae consensu factum, interveniento nimirum pacto explicito vel tacito hominis cum diabolo."—Ib., n. 23.

The sorcerer can be recognized, (1) by his own confession; (2) from the confession of associates; (3) if there is found on him a writing which he acknowledges and in which he gives himself to the demon, or if he is marked with the stigmata commonly impressed on witches; (4) if poisons, hosts, toads, human limbs or wax images transfixed with needles are found with any one; (5) if he is convicted of frequently calling on the demon or if a woman utters threats and one is found seized with disease or fascination; (6) if witnesses testify to seeing one anoint with poison or unguents cattle or infants or others who subsequently die.—Ib., n. 24 (p. 248).

Points out in detail to confessors the distinction between intellectual error, which is heresy, and the most grave sin of acts of sorcery, devil worship, etc., combined with orthodox belief.—Ib., n. 25.

He seems to know nothing of the subtilties of Sanchez and will not permit the removal of sorcery by sorcery in any shape. The utmost he concedes is that it is licit to ask a sorcerer to destroy the charm which he has placed, as this is simply a human action and involves no recourse to the demon. As usual, he cites Duns Scotus, who seems to be the authority universally cited as to this.—Ib., n. 27 (p. 249).

GRAFFIIS, JACOBUS A.—*Practica Quinque Casuum Summo Pontifici Reservatorum.* Venetiis, 1619 (1. ed., 1609).

Graffiis, a native of Capua, was Abbot of the Congregation of Cassino and Major Penitentiary of Naples.

He fully believes in all the powers ascribed to sorcery—causing death, impotence, sickness, figurines, tempests, etc., by sorcerers with the aid of demons.—Lib., iii, c. 1, nn. 13, 14, 19–22 (pp. 521–3).

Ligatures are made by bending a needle, saying "Quandiu acus sic stat non possit coire cum uxore," and until the needle is straightened the party is impotent.—Ib., n. 22.

Although his book is of papal reserved cases, it would seem that, at least in Naples, it was an episcopal case. "Quare, cum sit tam detestabile scelus, fit quod fere ab omnibus ordinariis etiam reservari soleat," as Naples, Gaeta, Cava, Rossano, Nola, Salerno, Conversano.—Ib., n. 18.

All these things, including the various forms of divination, "sapiunt haeresim manifestam" and are therefore subject to the Inquisition.—Ib., n. 33, 34 (p. 525).

Heresy, by the Council of Trent, was a papal reserved case and bishops were deprived of jurisdiction.

"Sub casu etiam includuntur strigae seu lamiae, quae vulgo dicuntur Ianarae."—Ib., n. 38 (p. 526).

Those are immune (from punishment) who go to a witch for a "fattura" but repent on the way or are otherwise impeded and so do not perfect the work. Also those who send by a third party to have something done or to consult—for they do not do it themselves.—Ib., nn. 44, 45 (p. 527).

This is very casuistical and would scarce hold.

Also those who, through simplicity and not knowing it to be a sin, use incantations to cure disease.—Ib., n. 50 (p. 528).

Bear in mind that all this is for the *forum internum*—instructions for confessors. Carena says "ut plurimum sortilegia solent reservari episcopis." This is when there is no intellectual error. When there is intellectual error, the sorcerer becomes a heretic and is subject to the bull *In Coena Domini.*—Carena, De Officio S. Inq., P. II, tit. xii, nn. 294–5.

Baucio, Carlo de.—*De Modo Interrogandi Daemonem.* Venetiis, 1643.

He gives instructions to confessors, in which he seems to entertain no doubt as to the jurisdiction of the priest. He says, if there is a written pact, it is well to destroy it to avert scandal, but not necessary, because the mere act of penitence annuls it. The penitent is bound to restore money received from the demon, if it has been stolen by him from any one; otherwise he can keep it, because the demon may have obtained it from the bottom of the sea or from treasure without a master, but he should be sure that it is not counterfeit or fictitious money that will disappear or turn to coal—as customary with devils' gifts.—Pet., xiii, pp. 20–1.

But Baucio admits that sorcery is a reserved case—in Naples. Doctors differ in general.—Ib., pp. 60–1.

Reiffenstuel, Anaclet.—*Theologia Moralis.* Antverpiae, 1758.

This work was first published at Münster in 1693. My edition (1758) is the tenth, with additions by Kresslinger. There was an 11th ed. in 1778. Reiffenstuel was a Franciscan.

In his instructions to confessors he includes, "Si poenitentes proponant in confessionali se esse maleficiatos vel etiam obsessos aut se tenere diabolum vitro sive annulo inclusum, vel se subscripsisse daemoni."—Theologia Moralis, tract. xiv, dist. 8, q. 3, appendix 1 (II, p. 128).

Some confessors err through defect, others through excess. The first reject everything without examination, as though they had in vain received orders "ad expellendos daemones et destruenda maleficia." The latter are too credulous and thus are very often deceived. Diseases inexplicable by physicians are contracted by sorcery, caused by sorcerers and witches through envy with the help of the demon, and this is more frequent than possession.—Ib., add. 1 (p. 128).

The distinctive signs of *maleficium* are those we have above from Gassner, with the additions of vomiting needles, knives,

keys, glass, and similar objects. Cautions against deceit. He gives four signs to indicate *maleficium* between married folk.—Ib., add. 2 (p. 128).

Signs to prove possession—but caution indicated.—Ib., add. 3 (pp. 128–9).

Long instructions as to dealing with demoniacs.—Ib., add. 4–7 (pp. 129–30).

If a penitent confesses to keeping a demon in a ring or glass and cannot get rid of him (for if he throws it into the fire or water it always returns and treats him more harshly than before), the confessor must be cautious lest he fall into the snare of one desiring to expose him to derision, as I have sometimes known. If it be true, however, the penitent is told to have faith and disregard the threats of the demon, or the confessor can take the object and at an opportune time, seated and wearing his stole, place the object before him and utter an expulsive exorcism, of which a formula is given.—Ib., add. 8 (p. 130).

When penitents say that they have given writings to the devil to serve him for a definite time now nearly expired, caution is requisite, for this is sometimes feigned to extract alms. Sometimes also there are witches desiring to disturb the confessor or to excite his lust and abuse the sacrament—which is to be suspected if, at the same time, they without shame describe their sins in the foulest terms. With such the confessor ordinarily wastes his labor and exposes himself to the gravest temptation. But if there are no signs of deception he should labor to bring the penitent to true contrition and fortify her in every way, and at the time of expiration of the writing he should pay her special attention.—Ib., add. 9 (p. 130).

Directions for penitents suffering from diseases caused by *maleficium*.—Ib., add. 10 (p. 131).

Directions for such patients who, moreover, eject frogs, needles and other solid substances. The demon is ordered in the name of Christ not to injure the natural organs in the ejection of these things. The things ejected are to be burnt in a fire which has been blessed. Explanation how such things are injected.—Ib., add. 11 (p. 131).

Instructions to confessor whose penitents complain of injuries to their cattle by *maleficium*.—Ib., add. 12 (p. 131).

Long instructions as to clearing houses of demonic spectres and disorders. Caution as to deceptions, especially on the part of roguish servants.—Ib., add. 12–14 (p. 132).

Caution as to *beatas revelanderas*. "Confessarium non falli si in simili casu ex mille feminis vix uni credat. . . . Et qualia mira efficiunt ope daemonis maleficiati? Item magi et sagae, quatenus confessarios incautos decipiant, et exinde tandem efficiant ut apud vulgum veris quoque apparitionibus et revelationibus nulla deinceps fides habeatur."—Ib., app. 2, add. 1 (p. 133).

Ecstasy may come from God, in which by visions and revelations he communicates his secrets. Fraudulent ones may be exposed by the application of stimulatories, cords severely twisted or cautery. The real "dividitur in naturalem, daemoniacam et supernaturalem." (The natural seems to be catalepsy, coma, and other affections.—H. C. L.) "Extasis diabolicus tunc contingat cum vel diabolus immediate vel hujus ope magi mentes hominum a sensibus externis alienant, figendo potentiam imaginativam ad certum objectum a diabolo praesentatum, in quo casu daemon vel externos sensus modo insensibili ligat vel impedit ne in easdem defluant spiritus animales ad officia sensuum necessarii." "Signa discernendi extasin supernaturalem a naturali et diabolica esse quidem difficillima," but he attempts it.—Ib., add. 3 (pp. 133–4).

He quotes with approval from Gerson the warning to confessors as to women who come frequently to confession with long narrations of their visions, "vix est altera pestis vel efficacior ad nocendum vel insanabilior."—Ib., add. 4 (p. 135).

If spectres appear in the form of toads and similar animals, it may be assumed to be a diabolical or imaginary deception, for the friends of God or souls assured of blessedness are not accustomed to assume such shapes.—Ib., add. 6 (p. 135).

Instructions to confessors called in to witches and sorcerers under death sentence. If there is a *maleficium taciturnitatis*, which, with insensibility to torture, is not rare with such persons, he should exorcize them. If they talk follies and laugh, it is a sign that it comes from an assisting or possessing demon, and he should spare no labor to bring them to a serious and sorrowful confession. If he succeeds, he should interrogate them minutely as to their misdeeds, including intercourse with incubi and succubi, when and how often; whether they have given writings written with their blood and received similar ones from the demon. Then he should make them renounce the devil and renew the protestation of

faith, assuring them that with this their writings are annulled, even if the devil does not surrender them; if they have writings from the devil, the confessor must take them and burn them at home in a blessed fire. If the witch has baptized children in the name of the devil, the confessor must obtain their names outside of the seal, so as to give them real baptism. When fitly disposed he can give them absolution and protect them from the further assaults of the devil, which are inevitable, by amulets, relics, benediction of the prison and clothes and a brief exorcism to be hung up at the door or window.—Ib., append. 3, add. 7 (pp. 139–40).

ESPEN, Z. B. VAN.—*Jus Ecclesiasticum Universum.* Colon. Agripp., 1748 (1. ed., Lovanii, 1700.)

Van Espen, the leading canon lawyer of his time (c. 1700), says that, although today the cognizance of sorcery almost belongs to the secular judge and he punishes, yet it is certain that bishops and pastors not only can but are bound to inquire as to this crime and all superstition and to anxiously examine everything which has any appearance of superstition and to instruct their people carefully in what consists this crime and superstition and how dangerous it is in disease and other troubles to recur to these superstitious remedies in which the devil takes part.—Jus Eccles., P. III, tit. iv, c. 3, n. 54 (p. 57).

Van Espen's remarks show the changed attitude of learned Catholics: "Sometimes the devil with his deceits can so move persons, especially women, or disturb their fancies, that they really believe themselves to have I know not what commerce with the demon, and when interrogated even confess and depose outside of court with a certain certitude, as appears to them, that wonderful things have happened to them and that they have dealt with the demon, all without foundation, for which see Cap. 12, Caus. 26, q. 5. And it will appear that often women are deceived who believe and assert as indubitable that by the help of the demon they have been carried to a certain assembly of witches and have talked and done wonderful things with the demon. But it is very likely (*admodum verisimile*) that these carryings to assemblies of witches are mere illusions of the demon and vehement imaginations of the women, and no faith is to be placed in them unless their truth is proved by certain arguments. It has been remarked by many that in those places

where many witches are tried and condemned ordinarily many other women persuade themselves that they also are witches; their brains are so occupied by the strong imagination of what they hear of the witches that they persuade themselves that they also have done or endured those things of which the others were accused. And thus it happens that by this inquisition of witches the number is wonderfully augmented; and conversely, where the judges do not make inquisition into witches, fewer are found suspect of this crime."—Ib., n. 53 (p. 57).

Again he considers the Cap. Episcopi, and, after quoting part of it, he remarks: "Haec esse mera deliramenta et somnia a daemone excitata solide ibidem ostenditur; quae merito leguntur, cum et hodie non desint mulierculae quae similibus incantationibus et deliriis infatuantur et a daemone falluntur."—Van Espen, Brevis Commentarius ad Decretum Gratiani (ed. Colon., 1748), Comment. ad II Partem, Causa 26, q. 5 (p. 138).

Patricius Sporer (†1714) gives full credence to all the horrors of pact with the devil, adoration of him, incubi and succubi, injuries exercised on others in body and soul "ex quibus omnibus nefandissimis sceleribus ordinarie compacti sunt magi" and he gives explicit directions to confessors in examining their penitents as to such matters when any superstition is confessed.—Theologia Moralis, tract. ii in 1 Praecept. Decal., c. 9, sect. 4, n. 46 (ed. Venet., 1731), I, p. 175.

But he argues that it is licit to seek a sorcerer to undo sorcery.—Ib., n. 43, p. 174.

La Croix, Claudius, S. J.—*Theologia Moralis.* Ravenna, 1761.

This was of high authority in the eighteenth century. La Croix died in 1714. The first edition is of about 1710, followed by numerous others, my copy being of Ravenna, 1761. There were successive editors whose modifications do not seem to be indicated in the text, so that there may perhaps be some uncertainty as to the date of individual passages.

"Debent principes et judices cautissime procedere in inquisitione circa sagas uti late probat Spe [Spee] *dec.* 8, ubi *dec.* 10 et 12 etiam ostendit contra Binsf. et Delrio Deum saepe permisisse accusari et involvi innocentes velut reos criminum. Idem repetit in append. post *dec.* 51. Nam etiam permittit Deus conculcari consecratas hostias ac patrari alia graviora crimina; immo daemonem posse in saltu repraesentare inno-

centem dicemus n. 1452. Non ideo tamen abstinendum esse ab inquisitione contra sagas, probat *decis.* 12, dummodo circumspecte procedatur juxta legum et prudentis rationis praeceptum. Deinde *decis.* 13 sqq. ostendit abstinendum esse ab inquisitione si periculum sit involvendi etiam innocentes, quia Christus, Matth. xiii, docet ad tempus permittenda zizania, ne forte simul evellatur triticum; procedi autem potest si malefici dignoscantur aut dignosci possint absque periculo innocentium."—La Croix, l. iv, n. 1431 (II, pp. 118–9).

Can a demon represent images of the innocent in the Sabbat? He can, no matter what Binsfeld and Delrio say to the contrary. There is the case of S. Silvanus, ejected from his bishopric because personated by the demon under the bed of a noble matron. All admit that the demon sometimes transforms himself into the shape of a wolf, goat, etc., and why not of a man? Nor does God anywhere promise not to permit him to assume the shape of the innocent. *Objection I.* It seems contrary to the goodness of God to permit his friends to be thus afflicted. *Answer.* God permitted the demon to afflict Job and other saintly men; also others to be bewitched and sometimes to be possessed by demons; also martyrs to be put to death at the instigation of the devil, and thus innocence to be oppressed in this life, to obtain greater merit or for other reasons known to him. Also, the man may be innocent as to magic but be guilty of other crimes, even as God permits thieves to be recognized in the mirror or basin of water of the magus. *Objection II.* If the devil could do this, he would do it oftener. *Answer.* Denial; because, if more frequent, innocence would more readily be proved and the fraud would no longer be believed. Besides, the demon would gain nothing, for the innocent, properly prepared for death, would die with great merit. *Objection III.* Anyone could say that he had not killed another, but the demon in his semblance did it. *Answer.* There is no similarity, for everyone admits that in the Sabbat there are many illusions and transformations and thus prudent men properly doubt as to the truth of these personations, while there is nothing like this in other crimes.—Ib., n. 1452 (p. 121).

The space devoted by La Croix to this discussion shows the importance attached to it. He cannot have known the prohibition of such evidence by the Roman Inquisition or he would have alluded to it. Evidently, moreover, he had full faith in the Sabbat.

PONTAS, JEAN.—*Dictionnaire de Cas de Conscience.* Paris, 1741.

This treatise, by an author who for fifty years was penitentiary of the cathedral church of Paris, was long a work of authority. Published in 1714 in three large folios, there were Paris editions in 1726, 1732, and 1741; of Luxembourg, 1731, and Venice, 1738, 1744, 1757, and 1780, besides the Latin translation by Amort, Augsburg, 1733, and possibly others. On the title-page of Amort's translation there is an allusion to a *Versio Genevensis*—apparently a Geneva edition. (Yes, a Latin translation, with Genevan tendencies, circulated in Germany. Amort gives this as the reason of his version.)

His treatment of the subject of the Sabbat shows the incredulity of the period, which yet could not wholly cast aside the authority of the past. In his treatment he says he follows Stryckius in his Dissertationibus legalibus, 1664. He puts the case of a judge before whom two accomplices accuse a man of having been transported to the Sabbat, and on whom was found an insensible mark like that made by a finger nail. The judge applies to a confessor for advice. The answer is that the existence of sorcerers, magicians, and diviners is too absolutely proved by Scripture and the acts of councils to be denied. But the accomplices cannot be received as witnesses of the pretended transportation to the place where the Sabbat is supposed to be held. This is shown by the Cap. Episcopi, which he proceeds to quote. It is true that this is not of the Council of Ancyra, but it is found in the Lib. de Spiritu et Anima of the Monk Alcherus and is supported by Cardinal Turrecremata, John of Salisbury, Gianbattista Porta, Alciatus, and others, though Del Rio cites others against it. We must conclude, therefore, that as this transportation ordinarily is only imaginary and it is very rare that it is real, the accomplices' testimony must be false, or at most doubtful and uncertain, though they may believe it true; and consequently that the judge must disregard it. It is true that if two unexceptionable witnesses, not accomplices, should depose as to the transportation to the Sabbat and to the abominations pretended to occur there as real things, this would suffice for the condemnation of the accused. But what likelihood is there that two such witnesses could be found, since it is certain that all this must be imaginary, produced by the malice of the demon, as we have shown, or may be merely the product of sleep without demonic participation.

A real corporeal transportation to the Sabbat, where abominations are said to be committed, might be sufficient proof

of sorcery, but the judge could not condemn the accused without certain proofs of its reality and it seems very difficult to conceive that indubitable proofs of the kind could be had. For, even if the two accomplices affirm that they have seen him and have eaten and drunk with him, their evidence rests only on sight and can be admitted only on the assumption that their sense of sight is reliable, that the medium through which they saw has not been changed by the demon and that there is a proportionate distance between the eye and the object. Now, there is every reason to believe that the sight of a sorcerer is affected by the illusion of imagination deranged by the demon, so that in sleep the sorcerer sees things otherwise than as they are, and that he thinks he sees that which he has never seen. And even if transportation to the Sabbat really occurs, one cannot deny that the demon can so fascinate the eyes of those transported that he can represent to them such persons and objects as he chooses, and can transform himself into such figures as he chooses to deceive them.

As to the witch-mark, there are all kinds of marks on the body not due to demons, and consequently such a mark is not certain proof, nor even a semi-proof of sorcery. As regards insensibility, this does not concern theology, but medicine. All we can say is that we always find on infirm bodies some insensible part, and a judge cannot regard it as a proof of sorcery unless there are other incontestable proofs that it is caused by the demon; but we do not see that such proofs can ever be found.—Pontas, s. v. *Sorcier*, Cas. 2 (ed. Paris, 1741, III, pp. 959–62).

A beautiful example of practical denial without absolute denial—admitting possibilities by rendering them impossible.

In Amort's Latin translation (Augsburg, 1733) this whole subject is omitted and there is nothing about it s. v. *Superstitio*. Was this a concession to the German Church, which was tardier than the Gallican to admit the new ideas? Amort on his title-page says that it is "ad mores Germaniae accommodatum."

Concina, Daniello. — *Theologia Christiana dogmatico-moralis*. Bononiae, 1760. (First ed., 1749.)

Concina denies that it is licit to employ a *maleficus* to remove a *maleficium*, if it is probable that he will seek aid of the demon. You must only do so "cum expressa protestatione quod fiat absque daemonis ope."—Lib. iii, diss. 4, c. 4, n. 34 (I, p. 120).

Women are more prone to it than men, on account of their greater credulity and curiosity, as well as their impotence in wrath and lust.—Ib., diss. 8, c. 2, n. 5 (I, p. 155).

"Ad peccatum bestialitatis revocatur concubitus cum daemone."—Ib., l. v, diss. 2, c. 7, n. 16 (I, p. 226).

Impotence from *maleficium*, if it cannot for three years be removed by prayer and fasting, is deemed perpetual and dissolves marriage. Also if it cannot be removed without another *maleficium*—which is unlawful.—Ib., l. xiii, diss. 2, c. 1, n. 31 (II, p. 294).

Liguori.—St. Alphonsus de'Liguori treats impotence caused by *maleficium* as a matter of course and recites the old rule that if it persists for three years the marriage is invalid. Even if the *maleficium* is removed by *maleficium* the marriage is invalid.—Theologia Moralis (ed. Romae, 1767), l. vi, tract. 6, c. 3, dub. 2, n. 1096.

"Hic notandum est communem esse sententiam adesse Striges, quae ope Daemonis asportantur de loco in locum corporaliter. Nec obstat Cap. *Episcopi*, ubi prohibetur sub poena excommunicationis fidem praebere talibus anicularum neniis. . . . Vide Elbel n. 527, qui asserit, cum Del Rio et aliis, contrarium opinionem, quam tenuerunt Lutherus, Melanchthon et quidam alii Catholici, nempe hoc evenire per meram illusionem et vim phantasiae, esse valde perniciosam Ecclesiae, quia conducit ad eximendas hujusmodi Lamias a poenis ipsis indictis; quod gravis damni est Christianae Reipublicae." —Ib., l. iii, tract. 1, c. 1 dub. 5, n. 26.

C. THE FINAL CONTROVERSIES.

I. Skeptics and Believers.

Influence of Rationalism.

A writer in the *Acta Eruditorum Lipsiensium* for May, 1714, says that Toland, in his Discursus de Cogitandi Libertate (Londini, 1713), argues that the Kingdom of Satan among men is destroyed by freedom of thought. It is entirely ejected from the United Provinces, where the freedom of thought is greatest. In England, where formerly every year a large number of witches were condemned, when freedom of thought was allowed and the new and sane philosophy was

introduced, the power of the devil was correspondingly decreased till in the time of Sacheverel with the attacks on free thinking it revived. (I suppose the case of Jane Wenham.—H. C. L.) So in the Protestant lands of Germany the inquisition and prosecution of witches nearly ceased with the introduction of the new methods of philosophy and of doubting about everything, while in the Catholic lands they still continue with the adherence to the old scholastic philosophy. To this Bentley replied in the *Acta* for July that, although none of the English clergy is willing or able to assert that now there are no true witches, yet now there are fewer stories about them than formerly. Before the Reformation men were accustomed to ascribe to the devil all extraordinary symptoms of disease, not because of the papacy but of ignorance of natural causes. This superstition was universal, not instilled by priestly art but innate in human nature, which is inclined to all superstition, however absurd and inept. It therefore was not the work of the sect of free-thinkers or atheists, but of the progress of medicine and philosophy, that the witch stories have diminished in England.—Acta Erudit. Lips., printed in Meinders, Gedanken und Monita (Lemgo, 1716), pp. 93–4.

Philipp Jacob Spener, the Protestant founder of the school of Pietism (1635–1705), expresses his unwillingness to discuss the question of evil spirits, on account of its uncertainty. There is no doubt of their existence, as Scripture asserts, and he has known cases of their appearance, but for the most part people deceive themselves or are deceived by imagination and illusions.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., I, p. 135.

It seems to me that the reason why the witch-craze was sooner outgrown in Protestant than in Catholic territory is explicable by the diminished authority of the priesthood in the former. The Reformation brought no change in belief; Protestants were as firm believers as Catholics and as eager persecutors. Among Catholics, however, an infallible Church had affirmed the reality of witchcraft; its discipline over the priesthood and the authority of the priesthood over the people rendered dissidence akin to heresy, if not absolute heresy according to the Malleus, and eradication was difficult—even modern theology teaches still the power of demons and the existence of pact, which infers the potentiality of witchcraft. In Protestant circles, however, the clergy no longer possessed supernatural powers and their influence naturally shrank; they held on to the belief in witches—strengthened in Calvinism by the increased reverence for the prescriptions of the Old Testament—but they could no longer arrest the development of enlightenment, however earnestly they might persecute enlighteners such as Bekker. The influence of religion over the fortunes of the struggle

is clearly manifested in England, where the only vigorous persecution of witches occurred during the predominance of Presbyterianism under the Great Rebellion, and in Scotland, where the ministers were the leaders in the teaching and punishing of witchcraft.

Mr. Herbert Spencer's idea of inherited experience explains a variety of phenomena which those who deny *every* kind of *a priori* notions are unable to account for.—*Athenaeum*, No. 2443, Aug. 22, 1874, pp. 232–3.

This suggestion offers a somewhat plausible elucidation of the decline of belief in witchcraft, in the face of popular prejudice, the apparently irrefragable evidence of judicial proceedings, and the conservatism of lawgivers.

Controversy aroused by Bekker.[1]

Bekker, Balthasar.—*De Betoverde Weereld.* Amsterdam, 1691–93. 4 books. (First ed. of bks. 1 and 2, Leeuwarden, 1690.) French version, 4 vols., Amsterdam, 1694.

[Although Mr. Lea had studied Bekker, as is evident from his penciled marks on the margin of the pages and from his references in *The Inquisition of the Middle Ages* and *The Inquisition of Spain*, no notes on the subject were found among these papers. He had evidently reserved the full analysis of the book until a later stage of his studies.]

Binet, Benjamin.—*Idée generale de la Theologie payenne, servant de Refutation au Systeme de Mr. Bekker, touchant l'Existence et l'Operation des Demons. Ou Traitté Historique des Dieux du Paganisme.* Par M. B*** (Benjamin Binet). Amsterdam, 1699.

This is probably only a new title-page to B's *Traité Historique des Dieux et des Demons du Paganisme*, Delft, 1696 (Grässe, p. 62).

The book was written during Bekker's lifetime (see p. 7).

Binet begins by arguing that the vulgar desires nothing so much as to be delivered from these objects of terror and that they cannot be banished from the world without destroying their existence. Thus he abandons himself to vice in the hope of impunity. "S'il n'y a point de Diables, il n'y a point aussi de peines à craindre" (p. 2).

A very forced conclusion. Bekker did not deny hell and future punishment.

[1] For the vast literature of this controversy one should use the bibliography of Antonius van der Linde (1869).

Says that the enthusiasm with which Bekker's first books were received is passing away with the appearance of his later ones and that his followers are abandoning him (p. 3).

Attacks Bekker's explanation of Eve and the serpent. Says it is a very simple matter. The New Testament says it was the devil who used the serpent to seduce the woman and all Jewish doctors have admitted this truth (p. 4).

The devil alone could not have made the serpent talk, but God could have made him do so (p. 6).

Thus the fall of man was brought about by God.

He admits the truth of Bekker's assertion that Satan is made in common belief a rival of God. Do not, he says, our theologians so exaggerate his power that they make us conceive him as a god? Is it not the commonplace of preachers to terrify the wicked? He is made the cause and director of tempests; it is he who excites wars, who causes famine and pestilence; he enters and presides over councils; he suggests evil thoughts to men. Finally his empire is so vast and absolute that he excludes the Creator. That appears surprising, but it is precisely the idea formed by the expressions of our most celebrated doctors (p. 9).

But, in the endeavor to reconcile the existence of evil with the omnipotence of God and to divide the responsibility for it between God and Satan, he naturally loses himself in a cloud of words (see pp. 11 sqq.).

In conceiving Satan as a slave completely subject to God, we must also consider him as a furious and powerful enemy when it pleases God to loosen his chain (p. 17).

In order to sustain his position, he has to admit that the descriptions of Satan in the New Testament are figurative and adapted to the vulgar opinions of the time. He makes a collection of them (p. 19) which is convenient:

Principalities and Powers—Romans, viii, 37 (38).

Prince of the world—John, xii, 31.

God of this world—II Cor., iv, 2 (4).

Against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world—Eph., vi, 12.

Him that had the power of death, that is the devil—Hebrews, ii, 14.

The devil as a roaring lion walketh about, seeking whom he may devour—I Peter, v, 8.

For the devil has come down unto you having great wrath, because he knoweth that his time is short—Rev., xii, 12.[1]

Satan which deceiveth the whole world—Rev., xii, 9.[1]

The accuser of our brethren—Rev., xii, 10.

Whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders—II Thess., ii, 9.[1]

When Bekker asserts that his theory of Satan being confined in hell conduces to the exaltation of the glory of God, Binet answers that there is a much higher conception of God's glory in his using the demons as his slaves, binding and loosing them and forcing them to do his work against their intention (p. 21).

The devil is a rod of fury in the hand of God to punish men; he is a miserable galley-slave who must bend under the hand of his Master (p. 22).

The bulk of his work is devoted to investigating the beliefs of the ancient and modern world in the existence of demons, good and bad, from which in his final letter he deduces that all pagans, ancient and modern, in Europe, Asia and North and South America have believed and now believe in them. Thence he concludes, "C'est qu'il est impossible qu'une seule et même créance, universellement répandue et constamment reçu, puisse être entièrement fausse dans le fond" (pp. 212–13).

He explains the limitation "dans le fond" by his not wishing to confound the substance of this doctrine with the erroneous ideas superimposed on it by diversities of imagination (p. 213).

Natural truths can be universally accepted because God has impressed them on the understanding of all men (p. 214).

If demons have been universally and constantly accepted by all the peoples of the world, it follows that this knowledge is derived from a solid source. It does not come from Scripture, nor from reason, nor from imagination; therefore it is derived solely from the operations of the demons (pp. 216–17).

With this line of argument he concludes that he has sufficiently refuted Bekker and it is unnecessary to examine chap. 24 of his livre i (p. 221).

Bremer, Joh. Chr.—Among the adverse works called out by Bekker is one offered as a disputation in the University of Wittenberg, November 6, 1697, by Joh. Christianus Bremer and printed under the title *Theses adversus Balth. Bekkerum circa operationes Daemonum in libro quem vocant Die bezauberte Welt.* Wittebergae (1697).

[1] Not cited by Binet, but added by Mr. Lea.

A weak performance. In a singularly confused style he proves first that there are angels and demons. Then he proves the operations of demons by reciting a few cases—going back for one as far as St. Jerome's life of Hilarion. Thence he triumphantly concludes that Bekker in the search of novelty passes from one insanity into another, for when one denies demons he denies angels and finally God himself. "Et cui haec assertio non est vera, patere illi dixerim ex quibus Atheismus recta decurrit fontes" (§10).

Beckher, Guilielmus Henricus.—*Schediasma critico-litterarium de Controversiis praecipuis Balthasari Bekkero quondam motis.* Regiomonti ac Lipsiae, 1721.

There was a first edition in 1719 (Grässe, p. 62).

The first volume of the *Betoverde Weereld* was published in 1690 at Leeuwarden and in 1691, enlarged, at Amsterdam. Vol. II was issued in 1693 (p. 4).

Bekker held that Satan, immediately on his fall, was thrust into hell and kept there, remote from human affairs (p. 5). Christ accommodated himself to the false opinions of the Jews and pretended to eject demons when he cured diseases. In short, Bekker denied what almost the whole human race had received about demons, he argued against the numerous texts of Scripture and all reason, and ascribed these to fables of heathenism introduced into Judaism and Christianity and transmitted to our days by popery. While he did not openly deny the existence of demons, he first shakes the faith of the reader and then craftily allures him to deny their existence (p. 6).

It is related that he more than once said in conversation that he had been laboring all winter to deprive the devil of the power popularly attributed to him and was firmly persuaded that, if the demon had any power or was not confined in hell, that he would have disturbed him in his writing and not permitted him to accomplish it. As this had not occurred, it could be deduced that the power ascribed popularly to the devil was a mere chimaera and fancy (p. 7).

To this his adversaries replied that it was the interest of the devil to spread incredulity, so that he might the more easily ensnare men (p. 7).

Bekker was led to the investigation by a case of pretended possession which imposed on him for awhile, as related by him at much length in Le Monde Enchanté, liv. iv, c. 9,

§§1–23 (which I have elsewhere, in consequence of its being used as genuine by Görres—H. C. L.[1]). He suppresses the name of the impostor, but it was the son of Nicholas Blanchard, a celebrated physician of the University of Franeker (p. 8).

As early as 1683, in a preface to a work on the comet of 1681–2, Ondersoek over de Kometen, Bekker commenced to treat on the subject. Then in various series of sermons on Daniel ii, Exodus viii, 18, I Kings xxviii and Job he was led to examine further into the powers popularly ascribed to Satan, which excited considerable attention (p. 9).

Thus from step to step he was led on to the composition of De Betoverde Weereld, of which the first half appeared in 1691 and the second in 1693. The same year he issued a German translation of the whole and in 1694 a French version (see preface to the French version, and Grässe, pp. 61, 62).

In the preface to his tracts, published at Gravenhage 1692, he acknowledges his obligations to Orchard, a pastor of "New England," whose treatise "The Doctrine of Devils" was translated into Dutch by William Sewel in 1691.[2] He limited greatly the powers of the demon and taught that δαιμόνιον meant not the devil, but the corruption and passions of the mind; he denied obsession and asserted that Christ did not eject demons, but cured men of insanity and other diseases (p. 12).

He also owed much to de Daillon, a French minister at Châtelheraut, exiled to England, where in 1687 he published "Examen de l'Oppression des Reformés," in which he ventilated similar views; these were extracted and published in Dutch, Gravenhage, 1692 (pp. 12–13).

Wagstaffe and Webster were also his precursors, but Beckher does not establish any direct relations between them and Bekker. Their works seem not to have been translated into Dutch—nor into German until after his time (p. 13).

Reginald Scot is cited by Bekker as a predecessor of his. The Discovery of Witchcraft was translated by Thomas Basson and published again in 1680 at Beverwyk[3] (p. 11).

Bekker was also accused of being a Cartesian and of having drawn his deductions from Descartes, to which some color was given by a little work of his in 1668, "De Philosophia Cartesiana," in which he defended Descartes' theory of the essence of the human soul (p. 15).

[1] See p. 1510. [2] See p. 1319 n.

[3] The first ed. of Basson's translation was published at Leyden, 1609; the second ed., Leyden, 1637.

De Betoverde Weereld excited universal attention; in two months after the publication of the first two books 4000 copies were sold and it was out of print. The last two books he suppressed for a while in hopes of restoration to his functions, which accounts for the delay in their appearance. There was an earlier edition of the first portion, printed in Leeuwarden in 1691, of 750 copies, which he vainly sought to buy back from the publisher; in rewriting it he modified greatly and softened his language and he was so afraid of surreptitious issues that he made it known that all copies were surreptitious which did not bear his signature (pp. 15–16).

Thus in the French edition in 4 vols., which I have, every volume bears his sign-manual.

A learned friend of Bekker's, on reading it, predicted that it would do more evil in a couple of months than the preachers with all their preaching could remedy in twenty years. His fellow clergy of Amsterdam demanded that it should be publicly burnt by the executioner (p. 17).

The church authorities of Amsterdam sought to convert him from his errors and appointed for this purpose three pastors and two elders, but in vain. He complained that his views had been misrepresented and was asked to draw up a synopsis, which he did, when it was unanimously condemned and he was reproved for publishing without a previous examination and permission; from this he appealed to the approaching Synod of Edam and claimed that his grade of doctor relieved him of the necessity of preliminary censorship. August 23, 1691, thirteen articles were presented to him for subscription within six weeks, under threat of deprivation of functions. A prolonged discussion ensued and the matter was finally referred to the superior Classis (pp. 17–18).

Meanwhile the Synod of Edam on August 7 summoned before it Bekker and representatives of the clergy. August 9 it ordered him examined on seven charges. This resulted in his being required to recant his errors and forbidden to print anything further without the public approbation of the Amsterdam Classis. Bekker asked for a copy of the decree and departed, disclaiming the jurisdiction of the Synod (pp. 18–19).

October 1, 1691, the Amsterdam Classis assembled with four deputies of the Synod and decreed that he should give a full reply to the thirteen articles. This he refused, when it ordered four of its members to draw up in writing a statement

of his errors, which they did. As he was obstinate, he was ordered within a month to recant or to resign his office. Then he presented 6 *Articuli Satisfactionis* drawn up by some one unknown and asked for delay, promising that perhaps he would adopt them and would not in future do what would hurt religion and the faith. The classis at first accepted the articles and permitted Bekker to continue his ministry, against which the consistories of Rotterdam and of East and West Holland protested. The articles of satisfaction were revised and increased and Bekker was offered that he should continue his functions if he would conform to the sentence and not publicly preach (his doctrines?). Though he had thus found benignant judges, he continued to defend his errors and the supreme classis on January 22, 1692, suspended him for eleven weeks (pp. 19–20).

During these eleven weeks Bekker went to Frisia to complete his book, but the circular letters of the Rotterdam consistory gave him no rest, and he returned to Amsterdam. The Classis there summoned him to defend himself and he went to Alkmaar. There, after some parleying with the classis, articles were drawn up and read to him reciting his errors, requiring him to repent and implore divine pardon and that of the synods, classes and consistories and to maintain strict silence as to his errors in preaching, catechising, writing and elsewhere. This he refused and wrote to Dr. Smidt, who had replaced him, ordering him to give up the position. Then he was forthwith suspended from his functions, deprived of communion and excluded from membership in the Reformed church. (This was in July and August, 1692.) When this was read to him he answered something, but the Classis adjourned after offering thanks to God, which angered Bekker and he went out. August 21, 1692, there was presented to him a resolution of the consistory approving the synodal decree suspending him and depriving him of communion; and, on his asking for how long, he was told, until the consistory was satisfied (pp. 21–2).

Bear in mind that the writer is distinctly unfriendly to Bekker.

This is what was publicly done in Bekker's case. Gives a long list of the sources. Meanwhile the colleges and doctors of the church in Holland were busily disputing with him. List of 18 of their writings (pp. 22–5).

Then follows a list of 12 more, of whom the general opinion

is that they all "optime, solidissime, elegantissime ac perquam humanissime sive singulari modestia Bekkerum refutasse"—and these lists extend only to 1693 (pp. 25–7).

Medals struck in his favor and against him (pp. 27–30).

One of these, quite handsome, in his favor, is engraved on the title-page of Beckher's pamphlet and may be worth copying.

Then he describes the engravings and epigrams called forth by the controversy (pp. 31–2).

Meanwhile the Senate (town council) of Amsterdam utterly disapproved of the decisions of the ecclesiastical bodies and complained repeatedly of the unlawful process of the synod. Beckher says that the disturbances then arising were calculated to throw the city, and indeed the whole region, into confusion equal to that which Germany had suffered. Bekker made no answer to the numerous writings of his opponents, saying that they would not convert anyone who had been won over by his book and that his replying would merely lead people to read the works which they otherwise would pass by. But in 1692 he published his "Die Friesche Godgelehrheid" in which he defended his book and showed the injustice of the attacks on it. Moreover he deprecated the medals and epigrams and poems, both in his favor and against him (pp. 33–4).

Bekker in his *Kort Berigt* gives a list of 25 writings issued in his favor, which he regards with contempt as the work of illiterate men, printed against his will (p. 34).

The controversy continued with occasional writings on both sides (pp. 34–5).

By order and exhortation of the town council of Amsterdam "revocavit quidem errores suos detestabiles Bekkerus, ejusmodi verbis tamen ut non tam fateatur se dum consignaret librum ex errore in errorem incidisse, sed quod non sperasset plurimis ingenii sui foetus scandalo fore, plurimosque hypotheses suas in malam partem interpretaturos esse" (p. 36).

He was removed from office, but his stipend was continued to him and to his family after death, the magistrates, while not approving his opinions or contesting openly the synodal sentence, refusing to permit his place to be filled until the Senate (qy. secular or ecclesiastical?—H. C. L.) should so decree. In this condition he lived for six years till he died June 11, 1698, in his sixty-fourth year (so all this took place in 1692—H. C. L.). Rumor at once spread that he had modi-

fied his opinions for the better, as though he had revoked all that he had laboriously asserted and constantly defended. His son, however, Jan Hendrik Bekker, showed the falsity of this in his "Sterfbedde van D. B. Bekker," which he published the same year. Bekker in fact expected his opinions to be ultimately accepted, as those of Copernicus had been or the writings of Maimonides, which were at first burnt and subsequently held in honor (p. 37).

Subsequent writers continue the controversy—some holding him and his book in the highest honor, others agreeing with him in part, others stigmatizing him variously as a Sadducee, a Cartesian, a Monotheist, a denyer of demons or an Atheist, others as a trifler whose ardor for novelty led him from one madness to another, others as a man of execrable memory and so forth (pp. 37–8).

Enumeration of a number of writings against Bekker's opinions of various dates from 1692 to 1716. Naturally the most prolonged antagonism was excited by his denial of demoniacal possession (pp. 39–41).

In 1694 an anonymous book, entitled "Concordia Rationis et Fidei," denying the existence of angels or spirits, which Beckher calls atheistic, appeared in Berlin. Its author is known to be Stosch, a privy councillor of the Elector of Brandenburg (p. 41).

John Toland, in his "Adeisidaemon, sive Titus Livius a Superstitione Vindicatus," to which was appended "Origines Judaicae," Hag. Com., 1709, treats witches and spectres as old wives' tales and frauds (p. 41).

He was answered by Élie Bénoist, "Mélange de Remarques Critiques, etc., sur les deux Dissertations de M. Toland," Delft, 1712. Also by Jac. Fayus of Utrecht, "In Defensione Religionis," Ultraj., 1709 (p. 41).

Christ. Henr. Amthor, Professor at Kiel, in his "Dissert. de habitu Superstitionis ad Vitam Civilem," Kilonium, 1708, treats the invocation of spirits and their appearance as a fraud and superstition (p. 42).

He was answered by Karl Arndt in his "Vindicia Parentis sui Jos. Arndii, Tract. de Superstitione," Rostock, 1710. Both parties continued the controversy with other writings (p. 42).

The chief defence of Bekker is ascribed to Chris. Thomasius, in his "Dissert. de Crimine Magiae," Halle Magd., 1701, and his "De Origine ac progressu Processus inquisitorii contra Sagas," Ibid., 1712. Also in the Appendix to the German

translation of the former book, viz., his "Erinnerung wegen der Winter Lectionen auff das Jahr 1702." Also his preface to the German translation of Webster's book, Halle, 1719. In this latter he explains that he accepts as true all the cases in Scripture of the appearances of spirits, provided that they admit of no other intelligent explanation. But the other stories of such apparitions outside of Scripture are either wholly false or are bedecked with fabulous circumstances—that is, 99 per cent are false and of the rest two-thirds or three-fourths are vitiated with falsities (pp. 43–4).

Against him appeared Peter Goldschmidt, pastor in Holstein, who had already in 1698 attacked Bekker in his "Höllischer Morpheus," and now published in Hamburg, 1705, his "Wöhlgegründete Vernichtung des thörischten Vorhabens Hernn Chr. Thomasius" (pp. 44–5).

Jo. Reich was earnest in defending Thomasius. There is his "Kurtze Lehr-Sätze von dem Laster der Zauberey aus dem Lat. accurate übersetzet," Halle, 1702; followed by his "Unterschiedene Schrifften vom Unfug des Hexen-Processes," Halle, 1703, and "Fernerer Unfug der Zauberey," 1704 (p. 45).

Under the name of Gottfried Wahrlieb an author in 1720 at Amsterdam produced a "Deutliche Vorstellung der Nichtigkeit derer vermeinten Hexereyen" (p. 45).

At the same time that Thomasius' "Diss. de Crimine Magiae" appeared, Felix Mart. Brehm published his "Dissert. de fallacibus Indiciis Magiae," out of which "Aloysius Charitinus" drew his "Discours von betrüglichen Kennzeichen der Zauberey," Stargard, 1708 (p. 45).

Simon Heinr. Reuter, in his "Mächtiges doch umbschränckтes Reich des Teuffels," Lemgo, 1715, refuted the hypotheses of Bekker, but taught that pact and the stories of witches were fables (pp. 45–6).

On the occasion of a pact attempted by a youth at Leipzig in 1707, there appeared in 1708 "Die neueste alamodische Teuffeley und Zauberey," which was promptly answered the same year, at Leipzig, with "Eine merckwürdige und warhafftige Begebenheit" (p. 46).

Then there is the satire ascribed to Abbé Bordelon, "Histoire des imaginations extravagantes de Mr. Oufle, causées par la lecture des Livres qui traitent de la Magie," Paris, 1710, translated in German, Danzig, 1712 (p. 46).

Oufle is anagram of *le fou*.

Beckher concludes by saying that he could name many other learned men who vigorously attacked Bekker's errors, and far more who followed him.

Daugis, Antoine Louis—*Traité sur la Magie, le Sortilgèe, les Possessions, Obsessions et Maléfices.* Paris, 1732.

Says in a preliminary *Avis au Public* that Boissier had completely refuted St.-André.[1]

In Preface flatters himself that he has laid down a method and rules by following which it is impossible to make mistakes in these matters (p. xvii).

The Parlement by an *arrêt* of March 2, 1572, condemned to be burnt alive a blind man of 85 or so, for sorceries. Also by an *arrêt* of February 26, 1587, it condemned to be strangled and burnt Domenico Mirot and Margarita his wife, Italians, who had appealed from a sentence of the Bailli of Mante (p. 116).

Pp. 51–126 are occupied with a long extract from a "Traité de la Police" by M. de Lamarre, Commissaire au Châtelet, who recites the history of magic from the time of the Fall. The two above cases are cited by him. The date is not given but, as he cites an *arrêt* of December 18, 1691, he must belong to the close of the seventeenth or beginning of the eighteenth century. It shows that secular justice in Paris was still credulous.

Daugis says that at the end of the seventeenth century a priest of St. Josse was burnt alive in Paris and "de nos jours" the same in the case of Père Cotton, priest of the parish of S. Paul (p. 129).

Sentence of the Inquisition of Avignon in 1582, on a group of sorcerers, relaxing them to the secular arm, in a body (p. 143).

The Sabbat and its devil-worship are a matter of certain knowledge (p. 149).

In proof he cites the *procès* of Macé and his accomplices condemned at Mantes some fifteen or sixteen years ago (c. 1716). Also the recent affair of the "Fermier" of the Abbey of Vaux de Cernai, near Chevreuse, of which M. de Broglie is abbot, which he recited to the king in the presence of all the court (p. 155).

Pasquier Quesnel, in his Reflexions Morales, points out as

[1] Boissier, Recueil de Lettres au sujet des maléfices et des sortilèges, Paris, 1731; Saint-André, Lettres . . . au sujet de la Magie, des maléfices et des sorciers, Paris, 1725.

one of the distinctions between the Protestant Churches and the Catholic that the former have lost the power of exorcising demons (p. 197).

He did not stop to observe that this loss has been accompanied with the absence of the hysteric epidemics that perplex the orthodox.

Long extracts from "Medicinae theoreticae Medulla . . ." by M. Paul du Bé, Paris, 1671, a book highly recommended by Gui Patin and three other physicians, MM. Puylon, Fontaine and de Mercenne. Du Bé fully admits diabolic possession and that many diseases are caused by demons either directly or through the artifices of magicians who use them. These diseases are incurable by medical art; physicians attempting it only expose medicine to derision and should abandon them to the priests (pp. 226–36).

The tone of Daugis' book infers that he feels that he is fighting a losing battle against the growing incredulity of the age. At the same time it shows how difficult it was for a devout ecclesiastic to understand how anyone but a heretic could withstand the constant and unvarying tradition and practice of the Church, from the time of the apostles, which has always assumed the reality of diabolic possession and claimed the power of exorcism.

Daugis' long succession of extracts from the Fathers and their successors are reinforced by his recital of cases in which the power of demons has been proved, not only by the possessed, understanding all languages and reading the secret thoughts of the interrogator but by a man of fifty who took a red-hot andiron and bit it, leaving the impression of his teeth; one girl carrying another through a blazing fire, when not even their garments were harmed by the flames; children of six taking fire in their hands; biting glass and eating flints; mounting to inaccessible places and throwing themselves down without injury; holding their bodies in the air while their feet were planted against a wall, etc. (pp. 260–1).

There is nothing too impossible for the credulity of the pious.

The author[1] of *Lettres Philosophiques, serieuses, critiques et amusantes*, Paris, 1733, explains the power of sorcerers to cause earthquakes and tempests to their control over subterranean exhalations and condensations of the air. He cites in proof the wind-making powers of Lapps and Finns; that in Scripture Satan is called the Prince of the Air; and the destruction of Job's children and slaves by a tempest.—Hauber, Bibl. Magica, I, p. 680.

[1] The abbé Saunier de Beaumont.

Controversy aroused by Thomasius.

THOMASIUS, CHRISTIAN.—*Kurtze Lehr-Sätze von dem Laster der Zauberey. Aus dem Lateinischen ins Teutsche übersetzet, und mit des Autoris Vertheidigung vermehret*, s. l., 1703.

The first edition is Halle, 1703. I have another edition of 1712, s. l. (Leipzig); also Franckfurth u. Leipzig, 1717. These are all the editions that Grässe gives. It is, I suppose, the vernacular version of his De Crimine Magiae, of which there are editions of 1701, 1722 and 1730. In German there are editions as above.[1]

In reciting the names of the principal defenders of [belief in] witchcraft he says of Carpzov, that he is today the monarch and most eminent of criminalists, but the things he brings forward from judicial acts are such evident and crass fables that a man feels ashamed to have read them.—Thomasius, §2, p. 5.

Speaks highly of Antoni Van Dalen, a Dutch physician (1638–1708) who in his works on the pagan oracles, idolatry, divination, etc., exposes many common errors as to the devil and his operations.—Ib., §3, pp. 7–8.

"Now that I have collected my former scattered and confused thoughts on the subject I feel assured that one must hold as true that there are some sorcerers in the world, which cannot be denied without great presumption and thoughtlessness. . . . But neither I nor any other pious man can believe that there are so many witches and sorcerers, so many as have hitherto been burnt, and I hope that no one will believe it who examines the matter with reason and understanding." He praises the "Cautio Criminalis" (whose author he does not know) as unanswerable.—Ib., §4, pp. 9–10.

"Godelmann admits pact but denies witches; Bekker throws doubt, if not on the existence of the devil, at least on his power and operations; the writer of the "Cautio" writes as if he believed in the existence of witches and their pact; the common people and the half-learned are full believers not only in the devil, but in the mass of the witches and that the proceedings against them are right and praiseworthy. I reject all these opinions and assert that there is a devil and that he operates externally and invisibly, but there are no witches and no compacts with him; that all which is believed of this kind is a fable, drawn from Judaic, heathen

[1] But see now the "Thomasius-Bibliographie" of Walter Becker in the coöperative work on Thomasius forming Bd. ii of *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Universität Halle-Wittenberg* (Halle, 1931).

and papal sources, through most unjust judicial sentences, hitherto customary also among Protestants."—Ib., §6, pp. 13–14.

Protests earnestly that he is sincere in rejecting Bekker's theories, which he proceeds to argue against.—Ib., §7, p. 14.

There is no warrant for calling Bekker's followers atheists—they are adaemonists. Foresees that his admission of the existence of evil spirits will not free him from similar accusations. Alludes to Theophilus Spitzel's "Die gebrochene Macht der Finsterniss" (Augsburg, 1687), in which he urges the authorities to continue with the greatest zeal the persecution, not only of witches, but of all those who cast doubt on the existence of pact and object to the customary procedure against witches, as godless and atheists.—Ib., §8, pp. 15–18.

The divination, etc., against which the Mosaic laws are directed is wholly different from modern witchcraft. There is nothing there about pact or the practices ascribed to witches, the Sabbat, etc.—Ib., §14, p. 23.

This argument and what follows are directed against Carpzov, whom he evidently regards as the most formidable supporter of the belief and laws against witchcraft.

He argues that the Jewish laws were binding on the Jews, but not on us, and takes for example the one which condemns to the stake the daughter of a high priest who becomes a harlot, and asks whether this would be applicable to the daughter of our Rev. Herr Superintendent—and yet there is more similarity between him and the high priest than there is between the magic condemned in Leviticus and the devil-magic believed in today.—Ib., §17, pp. 27–8.

He points out that in the case of the Witch of Endor (I Kings, xxviii) Saul saw nothing; it was only the witch who said she saw Samuel. She was a ventriloquist and the whole affair was a trick.—Ib., §18, p. 29.

When Carpzov appeals to the civil law, Thomasius replies that it is directed only to diviners and poisoners. There is nothing in it as to pact with the devil.—Ib., §20, p. 31.

When Carpzov says it is impossible to deny pact and the renunciation of baptism and quotes Bodin, Remy and Grillandus in support, Thomasius says he should be ashamed to bring as witnesses papist writers who fill their books with the chatter of monks and old women, the tales of melancholy persons and descriptions of the tortures through which

people are compelled to confess whatever is demanded of them.—Ib., §21, pp. 32–3.

When Carpzov says there is tacit as well as express pact and that all who have spiritual association with the devil make secret pact with him and are sorcerers who must be burnt, Thomasius rejoins that this will involve all thieves, adulterers, liars and other sinners.—Ib., §22, pp. 33–4.

Carpzov argues that adultery and murder are punished with death; witches commit adultery with demons and are murderesses in offering their children to Satan. Thomasius says this requires no answer, for Carpzov confuses the punishment of sorcery with the question whether it exists—thus assuming its existence without proof.—Ib., §23, p. 35.

Carpzov's last argument is that it is for the benefit of witches and sorcerers to put them to death, for the devil holds them so fast that they cannot free themselves before death. For this he cites Remy, whose execution of 900 sorcerers entitles him to full faith, who says that no one has heard of any witch that could free herself until she had confessed, either freely or under torture, and endured the penalty of the crime. To this Thomasius asks, "Who could imagine that a Lutheran jurist could fall into the absurdity of regarding the executioner as an official instrument of conversion," and why should Carpzov believe Remy, who was a superstitious man and the slave of the clergy? Besides, he misunderstands Remy, who merely says there are witches who cannot free themselves from their compact until they have confessed, from which confession, according to the priestly law, death must ensue.—Ib., §24, pp. 35–7.

He turns from the jurist to the theologian and attacks Spitzel. After disposing of one of his arguments, he adds that he thinks much more of those clergymen and preachers who, in place of beatific teaching, in the pulpit and their writings relate old wives' talk and superstitious tales; they are responsible that many people who have a little understanding and something besides their five senses and would clear themselves of the shame of superstition drift into the greatest danger of atheism; while the doctrine of Spitzel leads the mass into the deepest and most childish superstition; this is not only a more foolish but a more injurious sin than atheism.—Ib., §26, pp. 38–40.

Spitzel says that, if there are not real and true pacts between sorcerers and the devil, God would not have made

special laws against sorcerers, whence it must follow that all in the Bible is false. To this Thomasius answers that the premises do not justify the conclusion and that there is not a particle of evidence that the sorcerers of the Bible had pacts. —Ib., §27, p. 41.

Spitzel further says that, if there were not pact, it would shamelessly contradict the church Fathers, such as Augustin, Chrysostom, Tertullian, Epiphanius, etc., who not only held this to be true but opposed most earnestly those who denied it. To which I reply that it is shameless to misuse the reputation of the old Fathers by making them attest old wives' fairy-tales. Besides, these most worthy men, through their simplicity and fear of God were credulous and, as we see today, such persons are apt to be deceived by mendacious and hypocritical persons.—Ib., §28, pp. 41–2.

Spitzel says it would be the greatest impudence to contradict so many truthful and trustworthy writers as to their daily experience. I say it would be as great, if not greater, impudence to prefer superstitious writers to trustworthy ones, and foolish fables to prolonged experience.—Ib., §29, pp. 42–3.

And these are the grounds on which hitherto belief in pact has rested. If they amount to nothing, yet so many thousand men, either innocent or at least not guilty of this, have been put to a cruel death, under the pretext of special piety, praiseworthy justice and zeal for God. One may well be satisfied with what is said above, but in surplusage I will bring fresh reasons for my opinion, premising that no one can require of me mathematical proof, for the devil is not comprised in mathematics and susceptible of demonstration. But I will bring such proofs that their certainty is similar to that of mathematics.—Ib., §30, pp. 43–4.

He commences by disposing of the Temptation of Christ in a manner that must have been shocking to the pious.—Ib., §31, pp. 44–6.

Goes on to expose the folly and inverisimilitude of the belief as to pact, in which neither side gains anything.—Ib., §§32–6, pp. 46–9.

He proceeds to trace the origin of the fables as to witches and sorcery. After some preliminary remarks he begins with the Greeks. Passes over the poetical and legendary fables and considers only the dogmatical philosophies—Epicurean, Stoical, Platonic and Aristotelian, which he dismisses in a

most cursory manner, promising future consideration.—Ib., §§37–8, pp. 49–51.

Then come the Jews, about whom he will write at large hereafter. Meanwhile he says that about the time of Christ the Pharisees had endless superstitions about Sammael and Lilis and demons.—Ib., §39, p. 54.

The early converts, drawn from Greeks and Jews, brought their superstitions with them and these were adopted by the Fathers, and, as there was little to be found in Scripture to justify it, they twisted the texts, e. g., they made the serpent of Eden the devil and from Isaiah's prophecy of the fall of the King of Babylon they made out that Lucifer was the name of Satan. So the sons of God (Gen., vi) were called the angels of God who had commerce with the daughters of men, and thus, not the origin but the increase of the devil was accomplished. And now that the most intelligent Protestant expositors reject these errors they should cast off the results. If I do not err, this false teaching of the commerce of angels with women is the worst of all the illusions that have been connected with sorcery. There are also the manifold fables of the appearance of the devil in bodily form in the lives of Paul and Antony which many of our people hold to be true, although Erasmus had said that the whole book was the offspring of Jerome's brain.—Ib., §40, pp. 55–7.

After the Barbarians, the schoolmen adopted all these things and the compacts with the devil and conciliated the Platonic and Stoic philosophy with the Aristotelian, although this required the grossest folly. There was also the influence of the papist clergy to cover their false miracles and increase their influence and to invent demonic diseases for them to cure. These fables of pact served when a pious man resisted oppression and could not be burnt for heresy; he would be accused of pact and sent to the stake by false witnesses.—Ib., §41, pp. 57–9.

Italy was filled with such superstitions when the Justinian jurisprudence began to flourish in the universities and the Cod. de Malef. et Mathem. directed against diviners and astrologers came to be taught. Yet the Christian bishops of the Empire knew nothing of pact, in spite of which the clergy introduced it in the canon law by forced constructions of the civil law. One must not imagine that these maxims are derived from the Justinian jurisprudence, but they spring from the general prejudice, namely that sorcery is divine

lése-majesté and is such an abhorrent and secret crime that it requires torture. From this followed that such delinquents should be more sharply handled than others, also that they could be prosecuted after death and that their property should be confiscated.—Ib., §§42–3, pp. 59–62.

Comparing the account of Tacitus with the existing superstition in both Catholic and Protestant Germany, shows how much is to be attributed to the clergy before the Reformation as to belief in the fables of sorcery. There can be no doubt that before the founding of universities the Germans firmly believed in pact; so that subsequently such teaching was easily accepted. Whoever wants to know more about this can consult the Malleus and the preliminary papal bull. This is not literally expressed in the law, but must be referred to the unwritten law. The Land-Recht, bk. ii, art. 13, says, "Welcher Christen-Mann oder Weib ungläubig ist oder mit Zauberey umgehet oder mit Vergifftung, und der überwunden wird, die soll man auff der Horde brennen." These words, though aimed exclusively at injurious sorcery, were construed, as Carpzov shows us, by the Leipziger Schöppen as applicable to both innocent and harmful. So the Carolina distinguishes between them by subjecting the former to arbitrary penalties and the latter to the stake, and it makes no allusion to pact.—Ib., §44, pp. 63–5.

One might think that when Luther's Reformation freed the people from so many papist superstitions it would also have freed them from the monkish and clerical chatter about pact, but nothing like this happened. It was under the Elector August the Pious (1553–86), in the Electoral Constitutions, const. 2, that the as yet unwritten law was embodied as follows: "So jemand," it runs "in Vergessung seines Christlichen Glaubens mit dem Teuffel Bündnisse auffrichtet, umgehet oder zu schaffen hat, dass dieselbige Person, ob sie gleich mit Zauberey niemands Schaden zugefüget, mit dem Feuer vom Leben zum Tode gerichtet und gestrafft werden soll." As the Elector of Saxony was one of the foremost Lutheran princes, it is no wonder that this illusion spread in other Lutheran and Reformed (Calvinist) lands. This may be attributed either to Luther's prejudices as to the power of Satan, as appears from his writings and Table Talk, or to Philip Melanchthon, after Luther's death, introducing the scholastic theology and philosophy again into the Protestant Academies, as the Lutherans regarded him as the universal

teacher of philosophy in Germany, and the Reformed were not ill-affected towards him, because he to some extent took their part in their theological disputes. Or it may also be that some theologians desired to enjoy the profits which we have seen this error had yielded to the papist theologians, or again that the Lutheran jurists without reflection in their books on criminal practice copied the papist writers.—Ib., §45, pp. 66–7.

These are the causes why not only in the papacy but after the Reformation so many prosecutions of witches were had, and under the Protestants of Europe and especially the Lutherans the procedure was so astonishing and cruel, for the conscience of the judges ought to have been better instructed in place of being urged on by a pious simplicity—as Spitzel praises the judges and urges them to prosecute witches earnestly—a salutary work which he has performed to his utmost power in his little town. If one heard tell of Lower Saxony and Sweden he would learn with what great disorder these trials were carried on through inopportune zeal for God's honor. (Goes on to tell about Sweden, which I have elsewhere.—H. C. L.)—Ib., §46, pp. 68–70.

In this way (as in Sweden—H. C. L.) witches are treated today in Germany; but it seems that since the Cartesian philosophy, so opposed as to spirits to the Platonic and scholastic, has taken seat in the Netherlands, it has gradually drawn some Reformed theologians to its side; and also the German ones, who often have relations with them, in time are becoming more moderate and adopting opinions more in accordance with reason. So we hear less of so many inquisitions of witches; so we may hope soon that, as both theologians and jurists in Germany have shaken off most of their prejudices, the rest will be wholly cast aside. As for me, I willingly confess that I cannot go with Descartes in his doctrine as to spirits, which goes to the opposite extreme. Yet I cannot deny that this philosophy has greatly contributed to disturb in many universities that nest of scholastic fancies among which is to be reckoned the illusion as to the crime of sorcery, so that one need not fear that it will recover its former domination in the Protestant territories.—Ib., §47, pp. 71–2.

Argues that there never has been any proof of what might be called a crime, for there can be no proof of the non-existent. All the confessions related by Carpzov are palpably the result of torture. What judge would be so foolish as to believe a thousand women, if they unanimously confessed

that they had been to heaven and danced with St. Peter and slept with his hunting-dogs, and yet the witches' confessions are more absurd than this? The jurists' assertions that in secret crimes, such as adultery, poisoning, etc., certainty can only be reached by conjectures and signs are not applicable to sorcery; for those crimes exist, while sorcery does not.—Ib., §48, pp. 72–4.

The signs alleged by jurists amount to nothing; they are grounded on the authority of the papal inquisitors and are unworthy of belief for reasons stated above.—Ib., §49, pp. 74–5.

Argues against the received assertion that great external piety is a sign of witchcraft. Alludes to the cases of Gauffredi, Franciscus Rossetus and Grandier.—Ib., §50, pp. 75–8.

Discusses the signs specified in Carolina, art. 44—seeking to learn sorcery, threats followed by results, associating with sorcerers, having things used in sorcery, etc.—as sufficient for torture and shows their absurdity.—Ib., §§51–5, pp. 78–85.

What are the cautions which the judge should observe in prosecutions of witches, so as not to punish the innocent? Many of these cautions are stated in the "Cautio Criminalis," but Spee admits his belief in magic. *As I reject all sorcery as a fable*, I would advise this single caution—The prince, as the highest authority, should never permit an inquisition for the crime of magic, that is, for pact with the devil; for, as to the injuries which one inflicts on another through occult magic, be they natural or artificial, they are not in question here. The lower court should never carry through such a trial. I know that the intermediate court is accustomed to exercise the highest power in the state and that it has no authority to amend or abolish the laws and customs, but I am sure that there never would be proofs sufficient for an inquisition and the lower judges would restrict their procedure to the law and its prescriptions as to signs (of witchcraft), if they allow the accused the defence against employment of inquisition, which would sufficiently protect them.—Ib., §56, pp. 85–6.

It is noteworthy how he throughout seeks to cast the responsibility on the Catholic Church, treats witchcraft as a Catholic superstition and seeks to utilize Protestant antagonism as a factor against the superstition.

This is followed by a *Vertheidigung* (ib., pp. 89–98) which purports to be compiled from his notes for lectures in the winter of 1702–3.

As I have unfortunately experienced that opportunity has been taken through my *Disputation de Crimine Magiae* to accuse me falsely of not believing in the devil, disregarding the opposite which is clearly to be seen in the *Disputation*, I take occasion to say: (1) that I believe in the devil; (2) that he is the universal cause of evil; (3) I hold the fall of the first man and woman; (4) that there are sorcerers and witches who injure men and cattle in secret ways; (5) I believe in crystal-gazers and exorcisers who with superstitious things and blessings accomplish wonderful things; (6) that by these persons things are done which are not deceptions and cannot be ascribed to the secret powers of natural bodies and elements, but must come from the devil; (7) that sometimes things occur that proceed from superhuman powers and are not ascribable to God or his angels, *e. g.*, when from human bodies there come threads, needles, potsherds, hair, fish-scales, even from the ears; (8) I hold that all crystal-gazers, conjurers, exorcists, etc., should be banished from well-regulated states; (9) I hold that sorcerers and witches should be put to death who injure men in hidden ways; also when the injuries arise from hidden natural powers, or when no injuries are wrought, but the sorcerers and witches have sought to do it with their conjurations and deceits. But (10) I deny that the devil has horns and claws, or that he appears as a Pharisee or a monk, as men have painted him; (11) I deny that he can assume a body and appear in this or that form; (12) I cannot believe that he enters into pacts, causes men to give writings, sleeps with them and carries them to the Blocksberg; (13) I believe these to be inventions or false stories to deceive others and get money from them or obtain influence, or melancholic illusions or extorted by executioners; (14) I believe that the contrary opinion gains nothing when I concede that wonderful things happen through superstition and exorcisms. For who does not know, *e. g.*, that the Jews can stop a fire by throwing into it bread impressed with certain characters or that gypsies can set fire to stables and barns without causing damage? But I never heard that Jews or gypsies were wizards or had pact with the devil. I believe (15) that the common opinion gains nothing when I concede that some diseases are caused by the devil and are brought on by sorcerers with the devil's help. The holy men who have worked miracles by faith and God's power have made no pact with God and have given him no writing. Wherefore, then, should not the devil work through the faithless without visible pact? As God reveals

to the faithful and prophets through visions, dreams and voices, so can the devil reveal to sorcerers and witches invisibly the superstitious means to injure. I hold (16) that as the present witch-process is unfit, since its basis is pact, *quod non est in rerum natura*, and moreover should be most cautiously employed when people are to be convicted of injuring with witchcraft, it should require much proof and the ordinary *Indicia* prescribed in the criminal law are not just. And (17) especially in those apparently wonderful and supernatural diseases should great investigation be made to see that they are not deceits, even when testified to by learned and trustworthy persons, including physicians, for they may be deceived as well as others. I believe (18) that among these supernatural diseases, of which a whole book has been collected, scarce one in a hundred is free from *hocus pocus*. I confess (19) that when I saw a bowl-full of fish-scales drawn from a man's ear, I at first concluded that it must be by help of the devil and sorcery; but on consideration I could only say that I did not know. But (20) if it were proved that it came from the devil I do not see that a witch-process could be based on it, for then the question arises who was the wizard who did it and how could the judge become certain. A confession is easily obtainable by torture, but that is not sufficient. I fear that if you and I were tortured we would confess with all the circumstances that the judges might demand.

In a word, I hold that the witch-process is worthless, that the bodily horned devil with his pitch-ladle and his mother is a pure invention of the papist priests, of whom he is the grand arcanum to frighten people into paying money for soul-masses and inveigle them into giving rich properties and foundations for convents or other pious causes and cast suspicion on the innocent who say *Papa quid facis* as though they were sorcerers. Christ did not convert the sinners with such a devil, nor did the apostles make of him a corner-stone, the removal of which would ruin the building. Then it was said, "Who denies Christ, denies God"; now the cry is, "Who denies the horned devil, denies God." Were such absurdities heard, even in the darkest papacy?

Thus, after all, he concedes everything save pact, the Sabbat and incubi. He is really no further advanced than Spee, who denounced the cruel stupidity of the witch-process much more effectually. The distinction he draws between the devil *per se* and the horned devil may serve to conceal from himself the unreason of his position but could not carry conviction to others. Yet unquestionably Thomasius produced much greater results

than did Spee, for the intellectual atmosphere had changed and, as he was writing for Protestants, he had the advantage of abusing Catholicism for the excesses of superstition. The last paragraph justifies one perhaps in thinking that he was a greater sceptic than he dared openly to admit. It certainly does not agree with his opening profession of faith.

Thomasius gives in his *Gedancken und Erinnerungen über allerhand auserlesene Juristiche Händel*, Theil I, pp. 197–202 (printed in Hauber, Bibl. Mag., I, pp. 448–57), an interesting account of how he came to change his views on the subject of witchcraft. He says that he was so strongly of the general opinion as to witches that he would have sworn to all that Carpzov tells of the devil's making pact with them, having intercourse with them resulting in their giving birth to elves, and carrying them through the air to the Blocksberg, and thought no intelligent man could doubt their truth. And why? He had so heard and read, had given no special thought to the matter nor had occasion to do so. In September, 1694, however, a case was sent to the Faculty for its action and he examined the proceedings with the greatest diligence and care, making an abstract of the testimony and defence. There were a number of witnesses and various acts of injury to persons alleged against the accused, Barbara Labarenzin of Cösslin, all of which he details, the most serious charge that of the witch, Anna Strackefeld, Tobias Becker's widow, who deposed that Barbara had taught her witchcraft fifteen years before and they had often been to the Blocksberg together, statements which she maintained in confrontation and persisted in at her execution. All these accusations Barbara steadfastly denied. The evidence was drawn up in more than 150 articles, according to the methods introduced by inquisitors, although it could have been clearly stated in 20 or 30. In carefully considering this case he consulted Carpzov, the Malleus, Torreblanca, Bodin, Del Rio and such other authorities on magic as he had in his little library and drew up his vote to the effect that the evidence only justified the lightest torture, but he found his colleagues of a totally different opinion and was obliged to draw up the *Conclusum Facultatis*, to the effect that she was to be discharged with a warning, after taking the Urphede and she was to pay the costs of trial, but the proceedings were to be preserved and careful watch be kept over her life and conduct.

While he was mortified at the little respect paid to his opinion, when he came to go over the matter, with the new

light thus thrown upon it, he recognized how flimsy was the evidence; that of Anna Strackefeld was to be rejected, for little faith was to be reposed in a witch; the rest was largely hearsay, or accusations by single prejudiced witnesses based on conjectures, so that taken altogether the evidence did not justify even purgation by oath.—Hauber, *loc. cit.*

This has additional interest as showing how much more careful the judges were than formerly and how much the atmosphere had changed since the time of Carpzov, when the accused would undoubtedly have been burnt. Yet burnings were still going on. Besides Anna Strackefeld the proceedings allude to another—the widow of Peter Scharring who was burnt.

Hauber remarks, in 1739, that these superstitions are not to be ascribed to Catholics only, for in all religions there are today such superstitious people and Protestants would find it difficult to prove that their beliefs on witchcraft are less ridiculous than those of Catholics.—Bibl. Mag., I, p. 520.

The original Latin title of the *Kurtze Lehr-Sätze* is "Theses inaugurales de Crimine Magiae, quos in Academia Regia Fridericiana, Praeside D. Christiano Thomasio, pro licentia summos in utroque jure honores . . . consequendi . . . submittit M. Johannes Reiche . . . ad d. 12 Novembris MDCCI." Halae Magdeburgicae, 4to.

Hauber says that this is the celebrated Disputation of Thomasius which excited so much attention and was of so great service. He had long doubted whether to ascribe it to Thomasius or to Reiche, until he saw the letter of Thomasius to Reiche appended to it. In this Thomasius says he returns to Reiche the disputation submitted to his criticism. He praises it highly, says that Reiche has found the right way to the truth and recognized that the *Crimen Magiae* is a fable, through which the papist clergy deceives the unreflecting laity. It leaves still some doubtful points which require further investigation, and as Reiche proposes to issue a second and improved edition, with examples of witch-trials, he has set forth the points that have occurred to him in reading the Disputation so that Reiche may avail himself of them in the new edition.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., II, p. 308.

This would seem to leave no doubt that the work is really Reiche's and not Thomasius's, unless indeed the latter deemed it safer to put it forward under the name of another. Yet in his Vindication he treats the Disputation as his own (see above) and so does Hauber subsequently (pp. 333, 334).

It is rather remarkable that Thomasius's or Reiche's "De Crimine Magiae" was preceded by a few days by Braehm's or Bodinus' "De Fallacibus Indiciis Magiae"—an inaugural disputation held at Halle, October 22, 1701. It shows what was in the air.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., II, p. 765.

Apparently both disputations were held at Halle.

Hauber asks why Braehm's disputation attracted little or no animadversion while Thomasius's "De Crimine Magiae" was so bitterly attacked, and explains it by the moderate tone and concessions of Braehm, while Thomasius was so uncompromising in his treatment of Protestant jurists and theologians and his denial of Satan being the Serpent or the tempter of Christ, which were unheard of and opposed to Christian doctrine and Holy Writ (ib., pp. 767–8). Besides, the devil had little cause of complaint against Braehm, but much against Thomasius (ib., p. 771). The lively antagonism thus excited caused this disputation to become widely known throughout Europe and rendered it much more efficient than the other, which scarce attracted any attention (ib., pp. 772–3). Thomasius, in his Preface to the translation of Webster's book, refers to Braehm's as having preceded his, but says no one attacked it because it had not dismissed the *Crimen Magiae* as a falsehood (ib., pp. 765–6).

The first attack on Thomasius came from his own university of Halle. In the Programma for Christmas, 1701, issued by the rector, Joh. Franz. Buddäus, his explanation of the Temptation of Christ and the seduction of Eve by the Serpent were argued against.—Ib., pp. 774–82.

Brähm, Felix Martinus.—*Disputatio Inaug. de Fallacibus Indiciis Magiae, quam . . . Praeside Dn. Henrico Bodino, . . . submittit Felix Martinus Brähm,* October, 1701. Halae Magdeburgicae, 1709. [2. ed.]

This is a thesis for the Doctorate *utriusque Juris,* read in the Acad. Fridericiana. The author treats the universally received accounts of the evil works of witches and sorcerers as *ludibria.*

In 1484 Innocent VIII by a bull contained in lib. vii Decret., Tit. de Malefic. et Incant., appointed Henricus Institor et Jacobus Sprenger Inquisitors against witchcraft in Germany, and in their Malleus Maleficor. they show themselves as ready to burn old women as the pope was to order them to do so. The practice still exists among the Catholics and is

common enough, as is shown by the author of the anonymous "Cautio Criminalis in processu contra Sagas"—a book well worthy to be read by judges who desire to punish witches (pp. 3, 4).

The spread of the Cartesian philosophy began to shake the belief in these wonders—though prior to it they had been attacked by Francesco Ponzinibio, an Italian, Reginald Scot, an Englishman, and Wierus in his Praestig. Daemon. But the chief assailant of the superstition was Balth. Bekker of Amsterdam, a theologian well skilled in mathematics and physics, who published in the vernacular his Betoverde Weereld (Mundus Fascinatus), which was speedily translated into Latin, French and English. He argued that the belief was invented by the Papacy to warm the fires of Purgatory and fill the pockets of the clergy, who burned witches so that they might confiscate their property, or, as was the practice in many places, that it might pay the salaries of the Inquisitors (pp. 4, 5).

In this Bekker went too far, endeavoring to abolish the whole belief in place of stripping it of its absurdities, its superstition and too great credulity. Naturally he roused up a host of adversaries, among whom were his countrymen, P. Poiret, Johann van de Weyen, Andr. Beverland and Leydeckerus; the Englishman Glanvil, in his Sadducismus Triumphatus; and the Germans Beerns, Petr. Goldschmid and Pfeiffer of Lubeck (p. 5).

Bekker was led to deny the existence of the devil by the foolish fables current among the legists eager to convict for a crime so difficult to be proved as witchcraft—absurdities promulgated by the writers on the subject, such as Del Rio, Remigius, Bodinus, Malleus Malefic., Ghirlandus, Friderus Mindanus and other papists, as well as Berlichius, Carpzovius, Crusius and others (p. 6).

Brähm proceeds to investigate what sorcery is by the aid of Scripture texts and the Roman law, and concludes that it is worthy of severe punishment, though the *indicia* commonly relied upon for its proof are utterly unworthy of consideration by legal tribunals. He seems to have no doubt as to the existence of compacts with the devil and of evil wrought by witches upon those at a distance (pp. 7, 8).

When the concurrent belief of mankind from the earliest ages is considered, the absolute nature of the Scriptural assertions, and the character of the Imperial laws on the subject, the wonder is, not that men trained

in reverence to such authorities should believe in witchcraft, but that any intellects should be found sufficiently bold to shake off the traditional superstitions.

By comparing the Carolina, art. 28, 30, with art. 23, tit. 47, it will be seen that the *indicia* are signs which create a certain amount of presumption, which, if the accused cannot remove, he is convicted. Confusion as to value of the several kinds of *indicia*. Worthlessness of the "common report" and flight of accused on which legists lay so much stress (pp. 9, 10).

So, of the testimony of one witch that she has seen others at the Sabbat (which the vulgar believe is held on the night of May 1 on the Blocksberg—mons Bructerorum), which is so relied upon by authorities, Bodinus and his followers, according to the practice of Paris, considering that it alone suffices to justify torture and the stake. It may be a mere phantasm, or an appearance caused by the devil and his followers. Stryk and Spener quoted in support of this opinion (pp. 10–14).

Neither is any weight to be given to the assertion of a witch that she has seen others transformed into wolves, dogs, cats, mice, etc., "quia misera lamia ipsa decipitur glaucomate oculis ipsius objecto a Satana, ut talpa caecior in his rebus sit." Stryk remarks that he had often observed in the records transmitted to the juridical faculty of Frankfort that witches had confessed to homicide when the parents of the children who died testified that they died of some ordinary fever. See also Brunnemann, cap. 8, membr. 5, no. 72. Such appearances proceed from the devil. "Hinc etiam apud prudentiores medicos non ignota est morbi cujusdam melancholici et ab atra fuliginosaque bile proficiscentis species, quam *Lycanthropiam* sive imaginariam aegri conversionem in lupos vocare solent, vid. Paulus Aegineta, Instit. Med., l. 3, c. 6" (pp. 15–17).

Also the commerce with incubi. A witch confessing to this is rather to be treated with hellebore, as crazy, than to be condemned. Folly of the superstition, notwithstanding the confident assertion of St. Augustin, Civ. Dei, lib. xv (pp. 18, 19).

So the evils wrought by tempests after an angry old woman may have threatened an enemy. God regulates the weather, not the devil (pp. 19, 20).

As for the stigmata so greatly relied upon by Bodin, James I, Crusius and others, they are doubtful indications, as they may be natural marks, and the craft of the examiners may render them apparently insensible. Still, we believe with

Stryk that when such marks are so absolutely insensible that a needle may be thrust deep into them without pain or drawing blood, they render the accused suspect, especially if conjoined with other indications (pp. 20, 21).

The alleged incapacity to weep is no proof (p. 22).

He explains by natural causes the quiet slumber which some witches enjoyed on the rack (pp. 24–5).

Exceeding sanctimoniousness and attention to religious duties and observances has been held to be an indication of witchcraft. A Catholic writer (Cautio Crimin., dub. 8) even says "ut magiae insimulati sint a vulgo illi Presbyteri qui reliquis diligentius missas celebrarent, aut aliquid majoris devotionis prae se ferrent, adeo ut qui magus videri nollet, eum diligentissime sibi cavere oporteret in illis locis ab omni specie pietatis." It may be a mark either of piety or of hypocrisy, but not of sorcery (pp. 25–6).

Other absurd indications relied upon by jurists. If the accused on her arrest exclaims, "actum est de me" or "ne me morte vel tortura afficiatis, veritatem sponte loquar." Also the advice that they be examined immediately on arrest, for the devil then abandons them, to return after a time. Also that a fixed gaze, looking directly at no one, is an indication—or some peculiarity about the pupils of the eyes. Others assert that a most damaging proof is the bad smell of witches, which they get from the devil, who contracts it from his habit of frequenting the bodies of hanged malefactors. As though a spirit could be affected by such material agencies, and as if there were not ample reason for the ill odor of a squalid old woman, confined for weeks—often for years—in a filthy dungeon without change of clothes. So the Jews smell—but it is the poor ones and not the rich (pp. 27–9).

Also the indication of being accompanied by a strange-looking dog, or one of large size which the owner values highly [is absurd] (pp. 29, 30).

So with deep sleep, lasting for a day or two. This comes from natural causes. Foolish old women, too, may anoint themselves with narcotic drugs, perhaps given to them by a real witch, and in the prolonged sleep which follows imagine themselves at the Sabbat on the Blocksberg. Case in point related by Porta (pp. 30, 31).

So, absence at night is rather an indication of the infringement of the seventh commandment than of the first or second (p. 32).

Also stripes and wounds found on their bodies and not accounted for—alleged to be inflicted by the devil at the Sabbat to punish tardiness of arrival or neglect of commands (pp. 32–3).

Bodin and Besold consider it as a certain indication of a witch that her parent had been convicted of witchcraft, but Binsfeld, Mantzius and Del Rio take the other side. Bodin says the shortest plan to convict a suspected witch, if she has a young daughter, is to promise pardon to the latter and examine her, for she must be cognizant of her mother's crimes (p. 35).

Foolish people believe that the *Draco volans* is the means by which the devil conveys to his followers stolen property. It is simply the *Ignis fatuus,* the nature of which is now well understood by all who are acquainted with metorology (p. 37).

I remember, in looking over judicial records, to have seen a case in which a special inquisition was formed against a woman because in a quarrel she had threatened a man and he, after a few days, was troubled at night with an incubus (das Nacht-Männlein, der Alp, die Maare)—or night-mare. Quotations from medical writers to prove that this results from physical and not from supernatural causes. St. Augustin believed in incubi, see Civ. Dei, l. v, c. 23 (pp. 38–9).

In the records of witch-trials one very often meets with evidence, to which great weight is accorded by judges, that the accused has praised the cattle, crops, or trees of a neighbor, and that straightway they have commenced to wither and die. Folly of this—though there is some truth in fascination, but it has natural causes. Pliny's story of a people who had double pupils and whose looks would wither meadows and flowers (p. 40).

So with sending quantities of lice to an enemy—this is a natural disease, phthiriasis, note Philip II of Spain (p. 41).

Then there is the ligation of newly married men, "nouer l'aiguillette," "das Nesselknüpffen." Brähm seems uncertain whether to disbelieve this entirely, but he argues that it is not proof of a witch, since many people could perform the necessary ceremony of tying a knot in a piece of hanging silk thread with certain words, while the nuptial benediction was being pronounced, without being otherwise sorcerers (pp. 42–3).

Condemns the practice of overzealous judges who would hire sorcerers from other places to point out the witches of

their own districts—by the turning of a sieve, or other means (pp. 44–5).

Another foolish proof, given by Bodin, Wier and Berlichius —that a witch cannot go out of a church when there is a boy there whose boots are rubbed with hog's lard (p. 45).

Judges should understand that these and similar frivolous proofs are not sufficient to justify torture, nor is a confession obtained by torture under such circumstances sufficient to justify condemnation (p. 46).

Water ordeal, equally illegitimate (p. 47).

Becker, Andreas.—*Disputatio Juridica de Jure Spectrorum.* Jenae, 1745. [Earlier printings, Halle, 1700 and 1738. See Graesse.]

This is a thesis for the Doctorate of Laws, read at Jena, June 25, 1700. It is a curious illustration of the mental condition of the period that a Doctor of Laws should submit to the University of Jena, and that forty-five years later it should be selected for re-publication, a learned dissertation in which he describes the different species of apparitions sent by Satan to trouble and injure mankind.

Becker talks of Haus-Götter, Kobolds, Nixe, Wasser-Frauen, "in aëre conspicitur Draco volans, vulgo der Drache," Feld-Geister, Feld-Teuffel, Berg-Götter, Rübezahl, Berg-Mannigen, etc., with Incubi and Succubi. The devil prefers the human shape, but he can almost always be told by his repulsive countenance, the claws on his hands and his cloven feet (pp. 6, 7).

Even invisible Spirits come, "Quando tumultus excitant, omnia in domibus turbant, ollas, patinas, etc., subvertunt, scamna, mensas per scalas dejiciunt, horrendas voces variosque sonos edunt, et id genus alia, ubi omnino per sensus externos certiores fieri possumus de praesentia Satanae, licet nihil videamus. Et hoc specialiter, puto, vernacula nostra dicitur spücken, es spücket," etc. (pp. 7, 8).

Quite like some modern experiences, which make one hesitate to ridicule the superstitions of the last century.

Of old, those who deemed themselves wiser than their fellows laughed at the idea of spectres, because the monks invented so many fables of ghosts returning to ask for priestly ministrations to relieve their sufferings. Luther, however, put an end to the belief in ghosts by showing that the souls of the dead rested quietly and never reappeared. (Yet our author on p. 31 says, "Compertum est haud raro mortuorum

umbras ea forma habituque apparuisse quo dum in vivis essent omnibus cogniti erant."—H. C. L.) Now, however, of late, some men are found for the first time to disbelieve in all spectres. The principal of these is Balthasar Bekker. Argument against this incredulity, ending, "Si quis ulla unquam spectra revera apparuisse perneget, illum ego de ipsius maligni Spiritus existentia dubitare firmiter statuo, et si perstet in ea sententia, atheismo proximum iudico" (pp. 10–12).

He combats this from Biblical references and allusions to a number of well authenticated recent instances (pp. 12–17).

He then considers the legal question, when, as often happens, spirits seek to interfere with marriages and haunt one of the parties to a betrothal, the other can break off the match. If the haunting has commenced before the betrothal, the doctors differ, but the greater and wiser portion decide in the affirmative—Nicolaus, Sanchez, etc. If it has commenced subsequent to the betrothal, however, neither is in fault, and the marriage must proceed (pp. 18, 19).

If such obsession occurs after marriage, the case is doubtful, but he inclines to the opinion that it is not a cause of divorce. Relates a case occurring within his own knowledge wherein a truly pious woman was thus besieged, furniture broken up and burned before her eyes, filth thrown around her, and the family reduced from affluence to poverty, in spite of her constant prayers—whether it still continues or not he does not know (p. 20).

Question whether a tutor can be excused from his guardianship, if the house in which the latter resides is infested with spirits. Resolved in the affirmative (no authorities quoted) provided the guardian endeavors by change of residence to evade the spirits and finds that they always follow his ward (pp. 20, 21).

Whether it is lawful to take hidden treasure, guarded by spirits, as so often happens. Answered in the negative, as it is impossible to tell whether the spirits are of good or evil. If the spirits invite a party to take treasure lying under their guardianship, it can be done with a good conscience (pp. 21–2).

Treasure found by a man in his own land by the aid of spirits is to be confiscated to the fisc, according to the principle of l. un. C. de Thesauris, l. 5. C. de Malef. et Math. (p. 23).

But if the treasure be on the land of another, the discoverer is entitled to one-half (p. 23).

If a house given to a husband as dower with his wife be so infested with spectres as to be virtually useless, can he demand another house in place of it? This depends on whether it was valued in the dower or not. If valued, he can demand that the value be made good to him. If not valued, then it depends on whether it was haunted before or after the marriage contract. If before, there is presumption of fraud and he can demand another; if afterwards, it is one of the accidents of property, to which the husband must submit (p. 24).

If a man rents a house without privilege of subletting, and it proves to be haunted so that he cannot live in it, can he lease it to another who may not be thus troubled? Yes, for it is a case of necessity, which overrides the provisions of the contract (pp. 24–5).

As by §3. I. d. Testam., l. 21 ff., there must be no interruption in the signing of a testament, qy. whether the apparition of a spectre after some of the witnesses had signed, causing delay in the signatures of the rest, will invalidate the will? I think not, unless the final signing goes over to the next day (p. 25).

If a house is mortgaged, say for 3000 crowns, and spectres commence to infest it so that it is no longer worth more than 1000, can another pledge be demanded? No, but the creditor can claim his debt and force its payment or the tendering of satisfactory security (pp. 25–6).

If a house is sold and the purchaser finds it haunted, can he demand a rescinding of the contract of sale? Yes, if the spectres had infested the house before the sale, and he had not known it. His action would be *de dolo*, and he might be aided by an *actio ad redhibendum*. Proof of guilty knowledge on the part of the owner might be difficult, and the best means would be *per delationem juramenti*. If the house is sold by the fisc, however, there would be no recourse (p. 26).

If the seller were ignorant—long argument to prove that even then the contract should be rescinded (p. 27).

If the spectres had only appeared subsequent to the sale, it would seem that the purchaser would have no recourse. Indeed the probabilities are that his own wickedness was the cause of their coming (p. 28).

Long disquisition as to the same question in its bearing on the law of landlord and tenant—with the same principle applied. This seems to have been a point discussed before, for various authorities are adduced in favor of the right of

the tenant under such circumstances to throw up the lease, while Baldus held that unless the spectres appeared every day he would have no such right. Nice distinctions as to the amount of disturbance sufficient to justify the tenant in removing or claiming reduction of rent (pp. 29–30).

Servants cannot be forced to stay in a haunted house (p. 30).

As to presumption of death from the apparition of ghost of person absent and far distant. It is a good presumption, but not sufficient of itself to permit the second marriage of a husband or wife whose absent spouse thus appears, for it would lead to fraud (p. 31).

I could have an *actio injuriarum* against anyone spreading reports that my house was haunted (p. 32).

If a house is so haunted that it cannot be inhabited, should it pay its full tax? I reply no, though this must depend upon the custom of the place (pp. 32–3).

Is the evidence of a spectre, accusing a man of crime, to be received? Not unless it is confirmed by other proof, for the devil is constantly seeking to deceive. A spectre's evidence of the innocence of an accused person is legally worthless (p. 33).

If a murder is suspected, will the appearance of the ghost of the deceased, bloody or wounded, at the place where the crime is supposed to have been committed, be an evidence of the crime? Yes, and it should arouse the judge to greater diligence in seeking the criminals. The vulgar belief, however, that the apparition of a ghost shows that a crime has been committed is groundless, for we know that the ghosts of executed criminals constantly haunt the place of execution (p. 34).

Should punishment be mitigated if a criminal has been urged to crime by spectres? Case of Anna Margaretha Gänsettin of Wiesenbronn, who confessed to arson and alleged that she had been thus incited to it—the acts of her trial had been submitted to the Faculty of Jena the previous February. A simple allegation of such incitement cannot be pleaded in mitigation; but if a man has been constantly threatened by the devil, so as to leave him no time for resistance, it should weigh in favor of mitigating his sentence (pp. 34–6).

As demoniacal apparitions seek dark places in preference, dark prisons are particularly infested with them. Can a judge then thrust a man accused (guilty?) of capital offence into a

dungeon which he knows to be suspected of spectres? By no means, for he thus exposes him to the risk of committing suicide, and prisons are places for safe-keeping and not for punishment. Those judges are inconsiderate (*inconsulti*) who send the more atrocious criminals to dungeons which are known by experience to be thus infested, for the purpose of repressing their contumacy (p. 37).

It is the duty of the magistrate, when rumors arise as to spectres, to investigate the circumstances so as to prevent damage to property by unfounded reports, and to prosecute witches and others who may be found concerned in the matter (p. 38).

It is the duty of pastors, when spectres are about, to inquire into the cause and turn it to the reformation of the wicked, if their crimes have caused it—also to offer up private and public prayers for the removal of the apparitions (p. 39).

Johann Reiche seems to have been an earnest champion of the new ideas. In the Preface (Vorrede) to his *Unterschiedliche Schrifften von Unfug des Hexen-Processes* (Halle i/M., 1703), he says that for eighteen months he had been preparing to issue an enlarged edition of his "Disputatio de Crimine Magiae" and had it in great part completed, but had been interfered with by false accusations. He had at least promised himself the applause of intelligent people, thinking that the kingdom of superstition had gone with the past century, but he had experienced the contrary and found the same unreasoning judgment of his labors as in the thickest darkness of papal times. Therefore he had changed his intention and preferred to put forward the writings of others rather than his own. He therefore prints in his volume, four writings:

I. Malleus Judicum, oder Gesetz-Hammer der unbarmhertzigen Hexen-Richter.[1] This, he says, is evidently from the early part of the sixteenth century, as can be seen from its style. (He must mean seventeenth century. On p. 4 is an allusion to 1626.)

II. The Cautio Criminalis,[2] the author of which he does not know, but he finds that it is of old date, and not recent as he supposed.

III. The Christliche Erinnerung an Regenten u. Prediger of the renowned theologian Dr. Joh. Matthäus Meyfart,[3] who closely follows the steps of the Cautio Criminalis.

[1] For notes on this work see above, pp. 690–96.
[2] See above, pp. 697–729.
[3] See above, pp. 729–43.

IV. Viererley Sorten Hexen-Acta, to show what was held to be witchcraft.[1]

Romanus, Carolus Fridericus.—*Commentatio polemica de Existentia Spectrorum, Magorum et Sagarum. Annexa est Recensio plurimorum hac de re Opinionum.* Jenae, 1744.

This book seems to be have been regarded as a satisfactory defence of the belief in witchcraft. The first edition was Lipsiae, 1703, and there was a third, Lipsiae, 1777.[2]

The author declines to answer Bekker and devotes his attention to Thomasius' Dissertatio de Crimine Magiae (Halae, 1701).—Ib., §9, p. 4.

Speaks well of the Cautio Criminalis and its urgency of circumspection in witch-trials, which no pious and prudent man will deny, and points out that in dub. vi he proves that the German princes do well in prosecuting witchcraft and in dub. xii that it is not necessary to abolish the inquisition against witches.—Ib., §11, p. 7.

Quotes Bekker, l. ii, cc. 8 and 9, to show that B. admits the existence of the devil, and taxes Thomasius with saying that he denies it and calling him an Adaemonist while defending him from being called an Atheist.—Ib., §§12, 13, pp. 7–9.

He goes on to examine Thomasius's work, section by section, exposing inconsistencies and arguing acutely against his positions, after the manner of the schools, temperately but forcibly, and manifesting sufficient familiarity with antecedent literature.—Ib., §§14–23, pp. 10–38.

He agrees with the Cautio Criminalis, Malleus Judicum and Meyfart in urging circumspection on judges, though the latter wishes to abolish prosecutions altogether, while the two former admit their necessity.—Ib., §24, pp. 38–9.

Then he proceeds to prove the existence of sorcery and witchcraft, not by reference to Scripture or to the universal opinion and experience of mankind, but by reasoning based on the philosophy and physical science of the period. He evidently felt that the time had passed for appeals to prejudice and superstition and he desires to base his argument on reason, thus affording a marked contrast to the theologians and demonologists. He may not have been the first to do this, but he is the first that I have come across. It is impos-

[1] See above, pp. 1236–51.

[2] There is also an edition of Lipsiae, 1717.

sible to follow him in detail, but his views can be gathered from the rubrics of the sections:

§26—Demonstratio quod Diabolus operari possit in materiam (p. 42).

§27—Quod Diabolus agere in corpus, illudque movere possit (p. 44).

§28—Quod Diabolus ungulas, cornua aut aliam formam induere possit, cum monito (p. 45).

§29—Quod dentur spectra (p. 46).

§30—Dantur Magi, Sagae et Lamiae (p. 46).

§31—Satisfecimus probatione nostra petito adversarii (p. 47).

§32—Non defendimus lapsus Carpzovii, Spizelii aliorumque. Here he says that they have adduced no solid arguments for the existence of magic (p. 47).

§33—Non urgemus argumentum ab experientia fida et circumspecta (p. 48).

§34—Nec Theologicis nitimur probationibus neque ex Scriptura Sacra (p. 50).

§§36–38—Turns against Thomasius the concessions he makes as to the existence and powers of the devil and his influence over baser human nature (pp. 52–54).

Ends with a list of writers and their several opinions on the subject.

Brückner, Wilhelm Hieron.—*Commentatio de Magicis Personis et Artibus.* Jenae, 1712. (Reprinted in Jena in 1723 and 1725 and, finally, at Jena in 1750 in conjunction with a dissertation by Joh. Schack, *De Probatione Criminis Magiae*, which had been presented June 19, 1706, at the University of Jena.)

Brückner was Aulic Councillor and dean of the Legal Faculty of Jena. He insists strongly upon the reality of all the details of witchcraft and sorcery. Those who disbelieve in them he stigmatizes as atheists, and he especially endeavors to controvert the reasoning of Balthazar Bekker, whom he regards as the leader of the unbelievers.

His argument is based on Scripture texts, both of the Old and New Testaments, and is logically, if not unanswerable, not easily disproved. Besides this, he rests on the vast accumulation of testimony in every civilized country, the consentaneousness of the confessions of illiterate persons everywhere who could have no natural mode of intercommunication and who wrought wonders beyond the power of the most skilful physicists, the uniformity of the witnesses, and the uniform evidence of learned and pious men—the whole forming an array of evidence so strong that the wonder is not that men believed, but that the belief could ever have been shaken in those who reposed faith in Scripture and in legal evidence.

It is a perfectly legitimate argument for him to deduce from Matt., iv, 9, Luke, iv, 6, that when the devil desired Christ to worship him it shows that he wished to be adored—that God, moreover, will justly desert the wicked, that the devil will desire to be worshipped by them, and that they will willingly do so to obtain their own ends. The idea of a personal devil, seeking whom he may devour and manifesting himself in all sorts of ways and gifting his followers with many kinds of supernatural power, is so fixed in the beliefs of the age that it requires no argument, indeed, to prove it.

Among the universal assertions of witches, coinciding with each other, he enumerates that they are obliged to renounce the pact of baptism with God; that they are rebaptized in dirty water; that women having congress with the devil find his member cold; that they experience but little pleasure in the act; that they bring forth as a result not men but worms, which they burn and from the ashes make a powder wherewith to work their evil deeds.

Brückner says that many *neoterici* of great name call in doubt, or even deny, the existence of magicians and magic. Against them he alleges that we ought not to deny what Holy Writ asserts, what is most in accordance with sound reason, what we find approved by the most prudent men and what is confirmed by the experience of almost all times and places (p. 4).[1]

He highly approves of the writing by Romanus, the Leipzig jurist, entitled "An dentur Spectra, Magi et Sagae." He also alludes favorably to Abbot Breithaupt's "Programma de Protevangelio" and he is hard on Balt. Bekker, "qui hodie agmen ducit negantium Magos" (pp. 4, 5).

He assumes Satan to have been the Serpent. "Superbissimus est spiritus qui Adamum et Evam falsa persuasione seduxit" (p. 9).

He says that recently they had condemned to death a military officer of rank who had wrought much evil through pact with the devil; on the scaffold he had thanked God for delivering him from the power of Satan. He was not of a reserved and melancholy temperament, but from boyhood had been noted for great shrewdness and an open, though cruel and bold, temper. Brückner's son was present at the execution, where the officer manifested great joy and exhorted earnestly all who were there to take warning and resist the frauds of the devil, which had reduced him to his existing pass (pp. 13, 14).

We have in our college, from Altenstein in Meiningen, the acts of a case where a girl of fifteen was married to the devil

[1] Page citations are to the Jena edition of 1750.

on the neighboring mountain of Lobberg, in a crowd of magi and witches. Her younger brother, who was present, revealed it to his guardian, in whose house he and his sister were living. The tutor reported to the magistrate, who summoned the girl and she confessed. The devil accompanied her to the court, dissuading her from confession, which he told her would lead infallibly to her death. She said that when an infant her mother had devoted her to the devil, but on her deathbed deplored it greatly and urged her to pray God for pardon. We decreed no punishment for her but gave her to the care of pious clergymen (p. 16).

A number of magicians, named by the boy and girl as present at the nuptials, suffered capital punishment, not on this evidence alone but on much stronger proofs. One of them under torture asked to be relieved for a little while. In hopes of confession the judge ceased it, when he revealed nothing, but spoke about the safe custody of his money and then was seen to be dead. The judge and two schöffen testified that his neck was broken, so that his face could be turned to his back (Satan's usual mode of killing—H. C. L.). Another man laughed throughout all the grades of torture and felt no pain: he was discharged and said afterwards that under the torture his principal annoyance had been the exhortations of the pastor to repentance. In that same year at Altenstein a woman suspected of magic, before she was subjected to torture, was found dead in prison with her neck broken, so that her face was turned to her back. She had taken her little son to the assembly, but he had refused to join; the magi and witches consulted the devil how to prevent his betraying them and Satan persuaded the mother to kill him by throwing him into a deep hollow, which she did, and his body was found there—all of which was told by others "quae interfuerint stygiae illi societati" (pp. 17, 18).

The medieval terror of the devil is still supreme—"Tanta est principis infernalis versutia (experientia 5000 et plurium annorum roborata), tanta ejus potentia (cum toto suo regno amicissime conspirans) ut, si Deus catenas ejus solveret eique libertatem plenam indulgeret, nos omnes turpiter confunderet et in vertiginem praecipitaret, e qua non pateret exitus. Non omnia vero ipsi licent, nec nihil" (p. 19).

No sane person will deny that there are many false imaginations (in witchcraft) cunningly promoted by the devil in order to render all magic suspect. Great circumspection

therefore is necessary, not, on the one hand, to reject things which have probability, nor on the other to believe too rashly —as for instance, that a witch has seen certain persons at the Sabbat; that a person has a pact with the devil written with his blood; that a person is absent at night without being able to say where he was; that he has excited tempests and hail storms, lightning and thunder; that he bears *stigmata magica* on his body; that he feels no pain under torture; that his body often bears marks of beatings, of which he does not state the true cause; that he was heard by those peeping through a crack in the door to be speaking in a room with some one who disappeared, leaving a foul stench; that his parents were executed as magi; that he uttered threats and some supernatural injury followed; that credible witnesses have seen a dragon sometimes flying over and into his house; that lice were introduced (*immissi*). These and similar *indicia* are not always deceptive, but circumstances must be considered. Thus the *indicium de pediculis*, when joined with others, is not to be neglected, if they follow quarrels and threats; if it happens several times to different persons; if their number and source are unusual, as for instance, if the person affected changes his garments and the lice are at once as numerous as before; if those annoyed threaten to report to the magistrate and when the suspect hears of the threats the lice suddenly disappear. All such things are not to be generally accepted or rejected and a middle path should be found between use and abuse. Judicial prudence will not neglect the smallest circumstance in a thing so difficult and of such supreme importance (pp. 19–21).

Discusses the question of jurisdiction under the Church—claimed to be *mixti fori*, but, as magic was regarded as apostasy, for the most part it fell to the spiritual courts and especially to the Inquisition which, disregarding all rules, committed great excesses. Even after Luther, among Protestants, there have been abuses, to avoid which it would be useful if princes would order men, pious, prudent and experienced, to solve ambiguous cases, prescribe an accurate form of process against magi and determine the penalties for diversities of circumstances. It does not require much or very urgent *indicia* for the imprisonment of a person suspected of magic, especially if of low condition, because, if found innocent, he is discharged and this rather diminishes than increases his ill fame. If guilty, people more readily come forward

who have suffered injury and who have feared to complain lest horrible vengeance would be exercised on them. But most urgent and certain *indicia* should be required for the use of torture and I would recommend that in this, if in any crime, those who plead innocence should have an advocate, to be provided, in case of poverty, by the fisc, who should diligently investigate all the circumstances. I leave it for others to say whether those princes do rightly who promise immunity for spontaneous self-denunciation prior to inquest, but I would not deny it in cases where no deaths have been wrought, nor great injuries, and those are especially worthy of mercy who have been seduced to it by their parents (pp. 22–3).

That this should have been reprinted as late as 1750 at Jena, together with the Disputatio of Joh. Schack, shows how prolonged was the struggle of the conservatives. Bear in mind that Jena claims to have been a leader in the revival of science in the seventeenth century and boasted of the names of Daniel Stahl, Johannes Musäus, Johannes Fr. Buddäus and Erhard Weigel. (See Ludwig Keller in *Monatshefte der Comenius Gesellschaft*, XVII, p. 242.)

Was it not from Jena that Thomasius had to fly?[1]

Schack, Johan.—*Disputatio Juridica Ordinaria de Probatione Criminis Magiae.* Greifswald, 1706, 1717, and Jena, 1750.

Proof is *plena* or *semiplena*. *Plena* suffices for the decision by the judge and is defined by the doctors to consist of witnesses, written documents, confession, evidence of the fact, oaths, just presumption, fame. *Semiplena* is what gives the judge some belief, but not sufficient for sentence, and is furnished by a single witness, private writings and not-urgent presumption. Whether *plena* or *semiplena* suffices to prove the crime of magic will be considered in the following.—Schack, c. 1, §2.

Magic is a public crime of those "quorum persecutio est cujuslibet."—Ib., §3.

Magic is the same as *maleficium, sortilegium* et *veneficium*, whereby through illicit arts, with aid of the devil, men and their property are injured and they are deluded or divination is professed.—Ib., §4.

Pact is express or tacit. In express pact God is renounced and the person enslaves himself to the devil. Tacit is where, without special or express agreement, the help of the devil

[1] No: from Leipzig.—B.

is used by employing diabolic arts, whether to injure or not, or by using superstitious remedies.—Ib., §5.

The existence of magic has been denied by Weyer, Gabriel Naudé, Antoni Van Dalen, Balt. Bekker. The *celeberrimus* Dn. Thomasius admits that the devil can operate on wicked men from within and invisibly, yet denies that there are witches and *magi* making pacts with him; says this is a fable arising from Judaism, heathenism and papistry and confirmed by the iniquitous processes in use even among Protestants.—Ib., c. 2, §§1, 2.

Goes on with a long and elaborate refutation of Thomasius's arguments one by one. No. 14 is that never is there a true *corpus delicti* in magic. He admits this, but argues with Carpzov "quod in delictis occultis et facti transeuntis, ad quae pertinet magia, de corpore delicti non aliter constare possit *quam per conjecturas et indicia*; ideoque in his, scil. delictis occultis, praesumptionem et conjecturalem probationem communiter haberi pro plena et concludenti."—Ib., §3 (p. 36).

Says that Thomasius borrowed nearly all his arguments from Weyer.—Ib., p. 37.

De Thou, in his Hist. Universelle, l. lxxix (ed. Basle, 1742, VII, p. 153), regarded Weyer as of sufficient importance to chronicle his death in February, 1588, at the age of seventy-two. Yet he says nothing of Weyer's assault on witchcraft, though he mentions his studying under Cornelius Agrippa "magicis superstitionibus infamis," and describes his great reputation as a physician throughout Germany.—Ib., p. 38.

Schack says that Weyer's effort to clear Agrippa's reputation is of a nature to render him liable to the same suspicions, and adduces his Pseudomonarchia Daemonum in which he formally teaches formulas for invoking and conjuring devils.—Ib., p. 38.

Says nothing of Weyer's object of showing the absurdity of the belief—treats it as a composition of Weyer's.

Schack goes on to controvert the arguments of Reginald Scot—whose pestilent book, he tells us, infected many Belgians [i. e. Dutchmen] who, after the fashion of the Sadducees, doubted the existence of devils.—Ib., pp. 39–40.

Then he cites Bodin, Del Rio, Godelmann(!), Thummius(!), Crusius, Fredericus [Friderus] Mindanus as well-known writers who defended the common opinion of the existence of witches.—Ib., p. 41.

His definition of magic shows that every detail was still maintained—"Quod sit crimen quo quis cum diabolo, saepe in corporali specie vel bestia vel hominis vel monstri comparente, pactum init, quod velit, si diabolus ipsius voluntati, avaritiae aut ambitioni satisfaciat, cum diabolo scortari, in certo loco, ope diaboli per aera magos vehentis comparere, ac ibi cum aliis similibus diabolum adorare, tripudiare et luxuriari, ope diaboli hominibus, bestiis et frugibus vel tempestates excitando vel alio praeter naturali modo damna dare et post certum temporis spatium anima et corpore diaboli mancipium esse ac in aeternum manere."—Ib., §4, p. 42.

Diabolic magic is proved if anyone teaches it to a disciple.—Ib., §6.

If any one threatens injury by magic and the injury follows (but see §20 below for limitation—H. C. L.).—Ib., §7.

Converse with *magi* and witches does not prove, but renders suspect.—Ib., §8.

It is not proved by external piety, though many pious men have been accused on this account. But most magi and witches affect external signs of piety.—Ib., §9.

Confession alone does not work condemnation. When it is said that condemnation may follow confession without anterior proceedings and that no one can contravene his own confession, this applies to civil and not criminal cases. (See below §26).—Ib., §10.

Fame does not prove magic, nor make of itself an *indicium*, as it is deceptive, but it corroborates other *indicia*.—Ib., §11.

Flight does not prove magic.—Ib., §12, p. 45.

If a witch under torture says she saw another on the Blocksberg, it does not prove magic, though Bodin (l. iv, c. 2) says it suffices for burning without further proof or torture. Gives other opinions and concludes that it is pure fiction, like the Virgilian fables of the Elysian fields. Quotes Stryckius that it does form proof enough to justify inquest.—Ib., §13.

Magic is not proved if a witch says she has seen another person changed to a wolf, dog or cat. No faith is to be reposed on such testimony "quia misera lamia decipitur glaucomate oculis ipsius objecto a Satana." It is true that Bodin (l. ii, c. 6) champions these fables as gospel truths, but St. Augustin (De Civ. Dei, c. 18) philosophizes better, nor is it unknown to the more prudent physicians that insanity (melancholia) may take the shape of imaginary conversion to wolves—known as Lycanthropy.—Ib., §14, p. 47.

Nor is magic proved if witches under trial simply confess to intercourse with incubi, "siquidem talis confessio pro delira habeatur." The "Sons of God" were the descendants of Seth. (But see below §27, where he contradicts this.—H. C. L.)—Ib., §15, p. 48.

Magic is not proved if stigmata are found on those defamed, though Crusius, Berlich and Ostermann treat them as infallible evidence. But there are strong doubts, because the flesh can be deadened by drugs and other remedies and the executioner can use enchanted needles or induce insensibility otherwise, so they are fallacious evidence. But we admit with Stryckius that these stigmata or moles are insensible and bloodless and they render the accused suspect if conjoined with other weighty proofs. Yet Ericus Mauritius well cautions judges and notaries to watch carefully the executioner lest he use fraud.—Ib., §16, p. 49.

It is interesting to observe the struggle between common sense and superstition.

Magic is not proved if the accused cannot shed tears under torture. These trifles are accepted by some, but it cannot be denied that many persons from natural causes do not shed tears under torture. Physicians tell us that tears are more or less copious according to the humidity or dryness of the brain and those doctors are safest who teach that absence of tears proves nothing.—Ib., §17, p. 50.

Magic is not proved if women under torture lose all sense of pain, though there are many doctors who hold this to be supernatural and suggest many devices to break this silence. All this is vain if the natural causes of this stupor are considered, for most of the alleged witches are women of disturbed brain and it is no wonder if, through the squalor of gaol, mental suffering, intense agony and exhaustion of body, they fall into ecstasy as though into profound sleep. Wherefore we condemn the practice of executioners who administer potions against this sleep. It is not within the power of the demon to effect that the guilty, overcome by the sharpness of torture, should not confess their crimes. Besides this somnolence occurs with thieves and homicides when tortured. —Ib., §18, p. 51.

Magic is not proved by the parents of the defamed person having been convicted of it. There is indeed a common proverb—"Der Apffel fällt nicht weit vom Stamme"—but it

is not universal, and this opinion has been well refuted by Carolina, art. 34 et seq., and Del Rio.—Ib., §19.

(Del Rio, Disquis. Mag., l. v, §4, n. 22, p. 725, holds it to be a light indication, rejected by the more prudent writers unless conjoined with strong proofs. But education and training by evil parents creates suspicion justifying inquest in those not of good repute and, if there is another *indicium*, it justifies torture.)

We have said above, §7, that magic is proved if injury follows threats, but this is not to be taken *simpliciter*. The injury should follow immediately and the threats must be specifically the same as the injury, for if ambiguous, such as might refer to legal redress, they do not suffice. Moreover, they should be proved by two witnesses.—Schack, §20, p. 52.

(Del Rio, l. v, §3, pp. 716–17, considers threats followed by injury "efficax hoc indicium esse ad torturam," but he orders the judge to be circumspect and suggests the limitations stated by Schack.)

Magic is not proved by the *draco volans et alicujus caminum petens*—for this *draco volans* is only sulphureous and nitrous matter, massed together and burning, sometimes called, according to its shape, *ignis fatuus*, and sometimes *draco volans*. And when the vulgar, ignorant of causes, see it seeking some one's hearth (chimney?), they think the devil is bringing stolen things to his associates.—Schack, §21, p. 52.

Magic is not proved by the cold water ordeal, although this is upheld by Crusius and King James. It is superstitious and properly rejected by Del Rio, the canon law, Godelmann, Heigius and others.—Ib., §22, p. 53.

(Del Rio, l. iv, c. 4, q. 5, pp. 637–61, devotes to this question a very long and elaborate discussion, showing the importance it had assumed at the time. The supporters of the ordeal endeavored to argue away the canonical prohibition on the ground that the canons had not in view the crime of witchcraft, but Del Rio easily shows that the prohibition is absolute and general. Of course he condemns it totally, as out of the question. He equally condemns, ib., q. 6, p. 661, the ordeal of the scales, used in Germany, where they say a witch, however tall and fat, will not weigh more than 14 or 15 pounds. This Rickius also condemns. It is not expressly prohibited in the canons, being of recent invention.)

Magic is not proved by the fabulous denunciations made by witches, often containing foolish and impossible things;

nor is denunciation by one strengthened by those of others.—Schack, §23.

Magic is not proved by the confessions of witches that they were with others in the Sabbat, as many learned men consider the Sabbat to be a Satanic imagination and illusion; though some say that not all Sabbats are imaginary, since experience teaches their reality (Remy) and Binsfeld proves it by many reasons and authorities. We agree with Protestant divines that the devil must yield to the divine power and to that of the good angels, but as he was able to convey the Creator of earth and heaven to the pinnacle of the temple and to the mountain, it is not impossible for him to carry witches to the Sabbat really and not in imagination.—Ib., §24.

Observe this halting indecision.

Magic is not proved when one sells an animal with a promise of future happiness, for the animal may be natural.—Ib., §25.

If it may be natural, it may also be supernatural—I suppose a demon in that shape.

Magic is not proved when one witch confesses as to another, for the former cannot give a reason for her evidence from her senses. If no faith is given to an honest witness, free from all stain of crime, unless he can give a reason arising from his bodily senses, much less can we have faith in a witch confessing as to an innocent woman. A witch is an infamous person and as such is not to be believed as a witness, so that a judge is bound to reject an infamous witness.—Ib., §26.

Thus by §§23, 24 and 26 all evidence by witches is to be exeluded. He says nothing about legalizing it with torture.

Some hold magic to be proved when witches confess to having had intercourse with Satan, although real human offspring cannot spring from such union. But when we say that the devil can have real intercourse with witches, we understand it "quoad actum coeundi et in oppositione ad illusorium et imaginarium concubitum, non vero quoad effectum generandi verum sobolem humanum." For the devil can use an adscititious body and actually perform the office of a lover, which is the common opinion of theologians, jurists and wiser philosophers. Goes on to prove the impossibility of procreation with borrowed sperm—as proved by the universal testimony of its coldness by witches.—Ib., §27, p. 55.

BRUNNEMANN, JACOB.—*Discours von betrüglichen Kennzeichen der Zauberey.* Franckfurth und Leipzig, 1729. (First ed., Stargard, 1708; second, Halle, 1727.)

Says that while there are some, as Christian Thomasius, who deny the existence of witchcraft, most people hold that there is such a thing as pact with the devil and that even to doubt such a truth believed through so many ages is preposterous (p. 17).

He lays down the general principle that torture should only be used when the accused is almost convicted by evidence and only his confession is required for greater certainty (p. 23).

Common fame is one of the fallacious evidences of witchcraft (p. 26).

Ninety-nine out of a hundred prosecutions of witches arise from little villages through women's gossip (p. 27).

Accusations of accomplices and as to those seen in the Sabbat are fallacious (p. 27).

In connection with this he quotes an eloquent passage from Philipp Jakob Spener's (†1700) *Theologische Bedenken*, reciting various deplorable cases and saying that, if he were a judge, he would resign rather than prosecute a case of witchcraft (pp. 28–30).

Denies possibility of the demon carrying human bodies through the air. Regards such confessions as dreams, caused by narcotic inunctions (pp. 32–3).

Case of demoniacs should be severely scrutinized and their assertions that anyone has sent the demons to them are entitled to no credit and do not justify arrest (pp. 36–40).

Great reliance used to be placed, and even now partly is, on the stigmata or insensible spots to be discovered by pricking. He describes the needle used as more than a finger-length long, with both ends blunt, so that it is used rather to press obliquely than to thrust; it is recognized that the operator can readily deceive the judge with it (pp. 42–4).

The water ordeal is employed by tying the accused's right arm and left foot to a board and throwing her in the water. It is a papistical superstition, but the simple people still secretly have faith in it, not reflecting that the board would make an old woman float. It is not worth discussion (p. 45).

Metamorphosis into wer-wolves, cats, rats, etc., so often confessed under torture, is impossible. Like the Sabbat it may be the result of dreams (pp. 46–8).

Intercourse with incubi and succubi is impossible; it is a belief strengthened by the papacy and made credible against

all intelligence and understanding. It is therefore surprising that an eminent Mecklenburg jurist, Herr Klein, in a juridical investigation as to what to hold in witches' confessions (translated into German in 1707) admits that children can be born of such unions. Goes on with argument to refute St. Augustin (pp. 48–52).

Whether credit is to be given to the power of witches to raise tempests, and whether a person accused of it is to be prosecuted, depends on an investigation into the power of Satan over the weather. He evidently believes that wind and rain and hail depend on natural causes, but he pronounces no absolute opinion on this point as he does on others (pp. 52–3).

Nightmare is a disease and does not call for prosecution. Quotes from Dr. Albini, formerly physician to the King of Prussia and now medical professor in Leyden, who expresses his surprise that physicians ascribe to the devil all diseases that they do not understand (pp. 54–5).

Seeing ghosts and spirits in the night and being oppressed by them is the result of fear caused by darkness and solitude (pp. 55–7).

Sudden fear may even cause such impressions in daylight. But he does not wish to prejudice those who consider that one who does not believe in ghosts is only half a Christian (pp. 57–9).

The *Fliegende Drache*, when neighbors depose juridically to have seen it issue from the chimney of the accused, is not valid evidence, though the women believe it sent by the devil to assist his creatures in concealing things stolen (pp. 59–60).

Pretended apparitions of angels and ghosts are to be reckoned among deceitful evidences (p. 60).

When such worthless proofs have been customarily accepted, some have even found in the looks and countenance evidence of this crime—as when the accused cannot see what is directly before her eyes (p. 61).

Equally fallacious is the belief that the witch smells badly—as well she may when imprisoned in a damp cell in dirty garments (pp. 62–3).

Little more weight is to be attributed to despairing ejaculations, such as "It is all over with me!" (p. 64).

Inability to shed tears under torture is fallacious, as it depends on the constitution of the individual (p. 65).

Similar in character is sleeping under torture—to counter-

act which the accused is shaven all over and her secret cavities searched for charms. Sensible people attribute it to exhaustion (p. 66).

If a woman is absent at night, is it a proof that she has gone to the Blocksberg? This assumes the long abandoned belief of corporeal presence at the Sabbat—abandoned by all but some schoolmasters and half-educated persons (p. 67).

A paper written with blood can prove little, but can easily mislead (p. 68).

A special love for dogs has been cited as an indication (p. 69).

The place where the accused was born is sometimes regarded as an indication. The North is regarded as full of witches and there have been more prosecutions in Westphalia, Pomerania and Mecklenburg than elsewhere (pp. 72–3).

In Holland one does not hear of a single witch. There, as in England, one sees no stakes for burning. This he attributes to Bekker (p. 74).

He evidently considers that his collecting these deceptive evidences is a service rendered at this time, although he by no means asserts that they are generally accepted (p. 75).

If all these indications concurred in the accused, they would not justify torture, for they would not create probability, to an intelligent judge, that she was a witch. If she was tortured to confession, such confession would not suffice for the death-penalty (p. 76).

He then proceeds to consider the evidence set forth in the Carolina as sufficient for torture.

The first is teaching sorcery for pay. This, he says, is punishable, but not as sorcery, nor does it prove the teacher to be a sorcerer (p. 78).

2. When anyone threatens to bewitch, and it happens to the person threatened. An injury of an obscure kind can happen without pact with the demon (p. 80).

3. When one has especial association with witches. This is a very weak proof, for sorcery is a secret crime and one may honorably associate with those who are subsequently convicted of it (p. 80).

And so he goes on to show that they are all insufficient—but it is better perhaps to give here the brief instructions of the Carolina, which have evidently been expanded by translators and commentators:

"Si quis infelices maleficorum artes profiteatur: aut hominem incantationibus malisque carminibus se fascinaturum

aut laesurum minetur, et paulo post eveniat ut is, cui minatus est, detrimenti quid acceperit: atque is, cui minatus est, cum magis, lamiis, sortilegis versetur, tum ejusmodi res, characteres, libros, schedas, signa habeat, verbaque carmen in se continentia effari, ritus et gestus insolitos exprimere soleat; quem itidem fama vulgi pro mago, et qui magia delectetur, eique adhaerescat, collaudet, excuset, ferat, haec magiae certa indicia sunt, ad quae subjici quaestionibus delatus possit."—Caroli V Leges Capitales, c. xliv, in Goldast, Const. Imp., III, p. 527.

Brunnemann says it cannot be denied that these things are suspicious and that a person may be injured by them, but the question is whether he is injured by virtue of an express pact with the demon. He goes on to talk of sympathies and antipathies and that anyone who employs them for the damage of his neighbor is worthy of severe punishment. It makes no difference whether men and cattle are injured by mineral poisoning or by such hidden sympathetic means. In this case criminalists call sorcery *crimen veneficii.*—Brunnemann, p. 82.

Speaks of there being places in "our Germany" where enlightenment is beginning as to this and other matters, and there is need of complaints of ignorant and superstitious judges. There are preachers in the land who are so wrapt in fear of Satan and sorcery that no ox or cow can die, no beer turn sour or other untoward thing happen, but they attribute it to Satan and the evil people. It would be better if they taught their people fear of and trust in God.—Ib., pp. 85–6.

I have also the second edition of Brunnemann's *Discours*, Halle, 1727. The first edition was issued at Stargard in 1708 under the pseudonym of Aloysius Charitinus. See his Preface to the 2. ed., which is in a collection of his tracts. The date is of importance in the controversy.

Bayle (†1706) writes: "J'attends avec impatience un dispute que le docte M. Thomasius, Professeur en droit dans l'Academie de Halle, a fait soutenir *de Magiae crimine.* On m'a dit que les Theologiens de ce pays-là en ont porté plainte à la Cour de Brandebourg, mais on m'a dit aussi que le Roi de Prusse est resolu d'ordonner à ses Tribunaux de Justice d'aller bride en main à l'avenir dans les procez de sorcelerie." —Réponse aux Questions d'un Provincial, c. 39.

The king in question here was Frederic I (1701–13).

Edict of 1714.—Frederic William I ascended the throne of Prussia February 26, 1713, and on December 13, 1714, he issued an Edict, saying that among the abuses of criminal procedure it was reported to him that the most dangerous frequently showed itself in the witch-trials, which were not always conducted with due circumspection, but on uncertain proofs, whereby many innocent were tortured to death and thus blood-guiltiness was brought on the land. . . . As it was the royal obligation to see that no one was unduly oppressed and that innocent blood was not shed through untimely zeal and wrongly conducted processes, he had resolved that the existing procedure in witch trials should be investigated and as far as possible improved, so that in future such dangerous results should be avoided. Meanwhile, in order that those under trial or who may in future be tried may not suffer, but may enjoy our fatherly grace and clemency, we therefore command that all judgments in such witch matters which decree torture or capital punishment shall be submitted to us for confirmation before being executed. This edict is to be proclaimed in all courts, so that no one can plead ignorance of it. All judges and faculties before whom such cases come are ordered to send in suggestions for the improvement of procedure. Moreover (and this is the most suggestive of all) all *Brand-Pfähle* where witches are burnt are ordered to be removed immediately, wherever they exist.—Meinders, Unbegreifliche Gedancken und Monita (Lemgo, 1716), pp. 98–100.

Whether this proved conclusive or whether it was followed by further legislation abolishing punishment for witchcraft—for subsequent action see Soldan-Heppe, II, pp. 267–8.

Meinders, Hermann Adolph.— . . . *Gedancken und Monita wie . . . mit denen Hexen-Processen und der Inquisition wegen der Zauberey . . . zu verfahren. Auf Königlichen Special-Befehl, laut Edicti vom 13 Decembris 1714 zusammen getragen und aufgesetzet.* Lemgo, 1716.

Offered in response to the decree of Friedrich Wilhelm I asking suggestions from officials.

He says there are three points to be distinguished. (1) Whether the crimes of which witches are accused or which they confess are possible or not in the nature of things, or whether they are phantasies and illusions or arise from melan-

cholia. (2) Whether other persons, by use of poisons or other arts, inflict injuries, or not. (3) Whether they deny God and give themselves wholly to the devil in such wise that this can be clearly recognized from their acts and sins, which apparently are superstitions and apish follies (pp. 100–1).

As to the first point, there have been from of old and still are people in the world who, either from melancholia or evil training, imagine things impossible in nature and right reason. Quotes Pliny and St. Augustin, to whom he attributes the Cap. Episcopi, of which he prints the larger part. If such illusions of old women and simple folk are to be punished with death, all fantastics and melancholics should be put to death. So this first class, including so-called sorcerers and witches, should be treated with compassion and either given to a physician and not to an executioner for cure, or be confined in insane hospitals so that they may not spread their follies among the people (pp. 101–3).

The second class, who use poisons, can properly be put to death, but care should be taken that there are *corpus delicti* and *causa proxima causati*, for these foolish women imagine that through certain prayers and ceremonies and charms they can benefit or injure. These belong to the first class of fools, since right reason knows that such apish tricks are powerless (p. 103).

The third class, who lead godless lives and mislead the people into superstitions by looking through crystals and the like and give themselves out for sorcerers and witches and offer to teach the devil's arts, should be punished "pro qualitate delicti et rerum circumstantiis." Whether they should be put to death or given for instruction to experienced preachers he leaves to wiser minds, but he quotes the Carolina, art. 109, as a guide. Also refers to Thomasius' De Crimine Magiae and the translation of Wagstaffe (pp. 104–5).

As for the terrible abuses in witch prosecutions here in Westphalia, see the "Brandenburgische Deduction" against the town of Herford (Prussian Westphalia), whose sections regarding such witch trials can be read with amazement (p. 106). (What is this?—H. C. L.)

From these godless and abusive witch-trials and witch-burnings in the previous century, from 1600 to 1700, various towns in Westphalia, and especially Herford and Lemgo, were wholly ruined and laid waste—see the aforesaid "Deduc-

tio Brandenburgica adversus civitatem Herfordiensem" (pp. 108–9).

He calls attention to the fact that the royal decree assumes that there are witches, so in offering his suggestions he prefaces them with a presupposition that there are in the world sorcerers and witches who make pact with the devil and renounce God—thus evidently indicating that he himself has no such belief (p. 110).

He argues that the inquisition process can only be undertaken by the judge when there is a *corpus delicti*, but the *corpus delicti* must not consist of impossible and absurd things, such as bringing tempests, intercourse with incubi, riding through the air, going to the *Hexen-Tantz*, changing into cats, dogs and wolves. The accusation process should be abolished, as it mostly springs from hatred, envy, desire for revenge and other passions, unless the accuser will subject himself to the *talio* and agree to be burnt if the witchcraft is not proved (pp. 111–12).

Goes on to examine the *indicia* enumerated in the Carolina and dismisses them one by one with extracts from Thomasius' De Crimine Magiae, whose arguments are all based on the assumption that magic is a fable and therefore all proofs of it are worthless. Similarly, as to the abuses in witch-trials, he quotes Thomasius, who objects to Spee's *Cautiones* as based on the presupposition of the existence of magic and says that he has but one caution—as magic is a fable the prince should not permit inquiry about it (pp. 113–17).

All this Meinders warmly approves and says its truth is proved by experience, for where, as in Holland and England, there are no prosecutions, magicians and witches are not to be found, while in Italy and Spain and some Protestant lands there are innumerable herds of them and their trials, based on fallacious proofs, are effected by torture. Thus the only remedy is to abolish them and stay the hands of unjust judges thirsting for blood and gain (p. 117).

Quotes Dn. Templaeus, ambassador to Holland (I presume Sir William Temple, 1628–1699—H. C. L.), in his treatise *De Poesia antiqua et moderna*, printed in French, Utrecht, 1693, where he wishes that some learned scholar would collect from ancient writings all that is said about the incantations of witches and the illusions of demons. It would largely conduce to abolish vulgar errors and to save many innocent who

are burned as magicians and witches, of which as a boy I saw many instances of extreme cruelty, and although these abuses have been wholly extirpated in England for thirty or forty years, they still exist in Germany and Sweden (p. 118).

If magi and witches do real damage by natural means, they should be duly punished, and the inquisitorial process can rightfully be used, if the *corpus delicti* is proved (p. 123).

Meinders addresses most submissively to the king the advice that all witch-trials should be abolished or at least should not lightly be commenced without the *corpus delicti et causa proxima maleficii*, and he hails as a forecast of this the destruction of all Brand-Pfähle so as to blot out the memory of witchcraft (p. 132).

He says that in their little district (Ravensberg) they have resolved to restrict as far as possible all witch-trials, under whatever name and from whatever cause they come, for to extend them in these inordinate procedures would be to fill the whole world with sorcerers and witches (p. 140). If witch-trials cannot be wholly dispensed with and exceptional cases arise, and there are *corpus delicti et causa proxima, non remota et imaginaria causati*, the lower courts and Schöffen-Stühle are not to proceed at once to arrest and torture. All the circumstances and details are to be laid first before a renowned faculty of jurists, and then also (according to the nature and circumstances of the case) before a theological or a medical faculty, to obtain a *Consilium* or *Responsum*, or also before a philosophical faculty, and further to send such *Consilium* or *Responsum* to the royal court for confirmation or amendment. Then, in the Privy Council or elsewhere in the highest official quarters, in case it is determined to proceed, the defender is to be ordered to perform his office thoroughly and intelligently. When ended, the *acta* are to be sent to another Juridical Faculty to render judgment and this again submitted to the royal court for confirmation or reformation. Thus it will be almost impossible for a stupid or ignorant judge to shed innocent blood (pp. 141–2).

But the mere confession of witches *absque corpore delicti et causa proxima causati* is never to be relied upon, for there are simple and foolish people who imagine they can do wonderful things, impossible in nature (p. 142).

He asks whether all witches and sorcerers are to be punished with death and whether the law of God or Moses is not binding still on the authorities. He quotes Weyer, lib. vi, c. 24, who denies it and shows that Moses decreed death for

false testimony, for a bride found not to be a virgin, for killing a thief breaking into a house by daylight and other severities now mitigated. And Meinders replies that the Mosaic laws as to penalties are not now binding and cites Grotius, De Jure Belli et Pacis, lib. i, c. 1, §16, n. 7 (pp. 145–6).

Quotes Simon Heinrich Reuter in his tract on the power of the devil, who argues that in Exodus xxii the word *venefica* means poisoner, not witch (p. 149).

The class of witches and sorcerers who employ poisons to injure men and beasts are properly to be tried by inquisition, provided the *corpus delicti* is present, and to be punished according to their misdeeds, but these are not to be confounded with the old women who from disease or melancholia imagine themselves to bring tempests and to bewitch people and beasts (p. 151).

The third class of witches and sorcerers, who work no injury, but with superstitious ceremonies pretend to discover stolen things and the like, deserve some punishment, though not by formal inquisitorial process, but by summary process by the local tribunals (p. 152).

The Preussiches Landrecht of 1721, P. III, lib. vi, art. 4, §1, says that as there is no belief to be placed in pact with the demon, in unbaptizing and in sexual intercourse with demons and in riding through the air to the Blocksberg on beasts and in transforming at pleasure themselves or others into cats, wolves, goats and other animals and then assuming natural shapes, or in causing tempests and thunder and winds, but as all this is a false delusion, dream and fancy induced by Satan, therefore henceforth it is not to be considered that on this account a death-penalty is to be inflicted. While this did not in terms forbid prosecution, it removed the death penalty, and with time by common consent prosecutions ceased. The Codex Fridericianus of 1748 and the Polizeiregiment of 1774 have no further reference to this superstition.—Festschrift of the Albertine University of Königsberg, 1821, p. 5.

There were still defenders of belief in witchcraft. In 1719 appeared *Die grosse Gewalt des Teufels an zwey merckwürdigen Exempeln zu Neu-Angermünde* (Uckermark) *den Spöttern zu Warnung vorgestellet.* This was answered in 1720 by the *Diabolus triumphans* of an anonymous writer, who assumes the author of the former to be a theologian.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., III, p. 340.

Böhmer, Justus Henning.—*Jus Ecclesiasticum Protestantium.* Halle, 1720–44.

Böhmer (†1749) was perhaps the leading Protestant theologian of his time. As a privy-councillor of Frederick the Great, he was presumably enlightened, and as chancellor of Magdeburg and senior professor of law in the Academia Fridericiana (Halle), he had wide influence. His work, in five bulky quartos, was long a leading authority, first published in 1714, with reimpressions in 1744 and 1763 and perhaps more. My edition, the second, is Halle, 1720–44.

He follows the Catholic division of magic into heretical and non-heretical and quotes the bull of Alexander IV and that of Adrian VI and points out that as all magic operations are vehemently suspect of pact they are subject to the Inquisition, thus eluding the distinction of Alexander IV and subjecting the miserable accused to torture and the stake. Then he proceeds: "Enimvero ipsum *corpus delicti* seu *imaginarium pactum cum diabolo* nondum evictum, neque ejusdem vera existentia probata. Anilibus fabulis, hodie irrisioni saniorum expositis, non amplius pascimur, postquam processus contra hujusmodi homines qui tale pactum iniisse dicuntur, maiori cum sollicitudine instituuntur, nec amplius confessionibus horum hominum, imaginatione naturaliter depravata instructorum, unice fidem adhibemus, sed *medicos corporis et animae* adhibemus, quorum cura et sollicitudine id efficitur, ut mens aegra, ex corporis male affecti qualitatibus ad phantasmata quaevis suscipienda aptissima, per medicamina naturalia et spiritualia sanetur et in statum suum pristinum restituatur. Hac rationabili methodo non utuntur inquisitores, sola confessione sive extorta, sive spontanea et phantastica contenti, sub qua malo hypochondriaco gravissimo laborantes, ut confessi igni traduntur ex ignorantia constitutionis corporis male affectae." Some years ago there fell into my hands the acts of a prosecution against a most miserable man who repeatedly confessed to pact and to crimes beyond belief. The protocol showed that in the examinations his sufferings were supreme and that he repeatedly complained that the devil was in a corner calling to him. The judge's sentence was that physicians of body and soul should be summoned, who decided that he was subject to extreme hypochondria, nearly akin to insanity. Some years previous his head had been hurt by a fall from a wagon which had increased his confusion of ideas. He was bled and treated physically and spiritually and at length recovered his senses and admitted

that he had been misled by a perverted imagination into believing as true all that he had confessed. If the great mass of the sentences accumulated by Carpzov in his *Praxis criminalis* had been revised in this manner, it would be evident that the greatest wrong was committed on an infinite number of persons of diseased minds. I do not deny that wicked men, in hope of gain, endeavor to enter into such pacts, preparing writings and soliciting the devil to accept them; but I have always seen, and the accused admit, that the devil never appeared or accepted the writing. Such attempts never prove the real existence of such pacts nor do the stories told by the credulous demonstrate it, but at most show that such men are deceived by this vain belief.—Böhmer, l. v, tit. 21, §§22, 23 (V, pp. 461–3).

Compare this with the contemporary St. Alphonso Liguori.

Quotes *Cap. Episcopi* to show the imaginary character of the assemblages said to be held on the Blocksberg and adds "Quae fabulae tamen hodie adeo explosae sunt ut talia referentem insanire optimo jure asseri debeat," though in darkness (former times) they were believed, for which he quotes some sentences from Carpzov and adds "Haec adeo ridicula et male cohaerentia sunt ut nemo sanus eis fidem habiturus sit, quamvis eadem adhuc propugnet Tobias Granzius *De Defens. reorum*, c. 4, m. 2." Also Schilter (†1705), who says those are crazy who deny it.—Ib., §24 (pp. 464–6).

Equally imaginary is the intercourse with demons through which, in the Carpzovian sentences, Elben are procreated.—Ib., §26 (p. 468).

Gives a sentence rendered in May, 1735, on Thomas Frötscher of Ottersdorf, accused of the superstition of "Horchen in der Christnacht," listening on Christmas eve, and prophesying; also misuse of pious hymns for divination. He is let off with payment of costs and a warning that persistence in such practices will be visited with prison. The clergy are also ordered to convert him from his evil ways.—Ib., §27 (p. 470).

In the earlier portion of this Tit. *De Sortilegiis*, Böhmer treats at some length of divination and incantations with copious references to the Roman jurisprudence and concludes, "Utut vero etiam hodie talia carmina superstitiosi effutire soleant, quibus efficacia ultra modum ascribitur; iis tamen examinandis et redarguendis non immorabor," but refers the reader to Weyer and Webster.—Ib., §12 (p. 419).

He traces the continuance of these superstitions to the exorcists and the exorcisms and benedictions which they use—of which he gives numerous specimens. These are employed not only to eject demons, but against spectres and ghosts, storms and fire and mice and other animals.—Ib., §§13–21 (pp. 419–60).

It would seem that in 1737 Johann Friedrich Tentzel, J.U.D., of Erfurt, was seeking a publisher for a work he had written on white and black magic, in which he defended the existence of sorcery, controverted the writings of Thomasius, Bekker and Van Dale and argued that all Christian authorities were bound to punish sorcerers.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., III, p. 513.

As his name does not appear in Grässe he presumably failed to bring his MS. before the public.

Völckerling, Valentin.—*De Spiritu in Monte Gigantaeo Silesiorum apparente, vulgo Rübe-Zahl.* Witembergae, 1740.

It illustrates the tenacity of the belief in demons that in the middle of the eighteenth century a scholar should present and defend a thesis in the University of Wittenberg on the subject of the demon which was believed to haunt the Riesengebirge between Bohemia and Silesia. It is a serious work, with abundance of learning, accepting as indubitable "spiritus ille, montes Riphaeos, Silesiam inter ac Bohemiam sitos, potissimum incolens, hospes antiquissimus, et propter mirabiles quas indies propemodum edit operationes, admirandus" (p. 3).

He discusses the various theories put forward as to the assumption of bodies by spirits, and among others that of Emanuel Magnanus in his *Philosophia Naturalis*, who rejects the common explanation current since the days of St. Augustin, of inspissated air, and argues that the impression conveyed to the spectator may be produced by the skilful adaptation of the reflation and refraction of light, and in the same way the speech of demons is caused by their control over the undulations that produce sound—though Völckerling does not adopt this (p. 13).

He says, without accepting any theory, that daily use shows they can form a body in any similitude and often, with the permission of God, take the corpses of men and beasts for that purpose, for which he quotes Del Rio (p. 14).

Rübezahl assumes all manner of forms to deceive the senses. Sometimes he appears as a monk, then as a decrepit miner, or a horse or a gigantic frog or toad (p. 16).

Tells, from Georgius Agricola, of a frightful demon at Anneberg who with his breath slew more than a dozen laborers in a grove (p. 17).

Rübezahl excites tempests, brings medical help, works magic, possesses treasures, accompanies travellers, sometimes to their destruction, and acts as hunter (p. 18).

No one can deny to demons the power of exciting tempests (p. 18), for which he quotes Weyer (but improperly, for Weyer says, De Praestigiis Daemonum, l. iii, c. 16, §1, that they foresee when disturbances of the elements are to occur, or when God uses them as instruments of punishment, and they use this knowledge to deceive witches and lead them to imagine that by throwing stones behind them, or flinging water from a torrent, or stirring water with their finger in a hole made in the ground, or boiling hogs' bristles in a pot, or placing logs across streams they can bring storms.—H. C. L.) But Völckerling proceeds to extol Rübezahl's knowledge of the secrets of nature and of curative herbs which he uses to relieve disease and he quotes from Martin Opitz' "Nympha Hercina":

"Du Riesen-Herr, du Artz, Berg-Gott komm herfür,
Der jene, so dich ehrt, erwartet deiner hier" (p. 19).

And he is most skilful in both natural and demonic magic, by which he deceives the senses, making people take the shadow for light and phantasms for fact (p. 19). Then as to his wealth—he is master of all the riches of the mountains, which he distributes at will—though he more frequently gives false gold than real (p. 20). Then as a guide for travellers he often appears as a monk and offers to show them the way through the forests and when he has led them astray he springs into a tree with a resounding derisive laugh (p. 21). Then he frequently appears as a hunter, both by night and day, whence it is said that he is the spirit of a noble who was excessively and cruelly given to the chase (p. 22). Others say that he was the ancient Monychus, the greatest of the giants (Juvenal, Sat. i)—others Enceladus, others Rokyzana, the Hussite, others a great magician, others an Italian monk, others a French noble, others the Genius of the Riesengebirge, guarding its treasures and keeping off intruders; others that he was son of a cobbler of Lignitz, cursed by his mother, and appearing in the mountain after the fierce battle of Lignitz (p. 24). But he has frequented the mountain for several centuries and is proof against all charms and exorcisms to drive him away—

save when sometimes he appears to yield to them for purposes of deception (pp. 27–8). Ends with a long and learned dissertation, reinforced with abundant authorities, as to the mountains and their nomenclature (pp. 29–32).

Hauber, in 1741, alludes to a contemporaneous *Monatliche Unterredung von dem Reich der Geister* and says its author has abundant stock of ghost and devil histories and is the Del Rio of our time, or would be if his *Unterredung* is continued.—Bibl. Mag., III, p. 88.

It was continued, for in 1742 Hauber attacks it again for pretending to prove that the devil can form a visible body out of air and enter into compacts with men.—Ib., pp. 150–1.

The controversy evidently was not as yet over and Hauber feels that he is engaged in it, which gives a certain dignity and importance to his labors. The *Monatliche Unterredung* seems to have lost no opportunity of assailing Thomasius.—Ib., p. 155.

Hauber's opinion as to the clergy of his time is forcibly expressed. "Many of the clergy are too superstitious in these matters; they always seek to make the natural supernatural and spare no pains to make an inconceivable wonder out of a perfectly conceivable thing, so that others, especially the simple masses, shall not be relieved from superstition, but shall remain in blindness and prejudice."—Bibl. Mag., III, p. 157.

That all the Protestant clergy at this period were not as enlightened as Böhmer is seen when Hauber's Bibliotheca Magica was reviewed in the Theologische Sammlung, No. xv, p. 140, in 1738, and sharply criticized, among other things, for asserting the impossibility of sexual relations between the devil and human beings, and of the devil creating atmospheric disturbances. He is asked what proof he has to offer for this and is told that, until he can bring forward such proofs unanswerably clear, he has no right to characterize honorable persons who believe in these things as foolish or wicked.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., II, p. 25.

Hauber says that the belief in the power of witches to destroy the harvests with storms is still (1740) ineradicably planted in the minds of many and it is not long since we have seen the most deplorable and shocking results of this belief in a neighboring kingdom. It is to this superstition that he

attributes the wide extent of the witch process in the Evangelical lands.—Ib., pp. 343–5.

This is apt to be lost sight of in the more dramatic details of the Sabbat, but if we reflect we must recognize that weather-making almost invariably formed part of the confessions. In her eagerness to escape further torture by establishing belief in the fullness and accuracy of her confession, the accused would recall whatever destructive tempests or frosts or droughts had occurred for years and would ascribe them to herself. And this would be perhaps the most dreaded of her evil powers; the killing of an occasional horse or cow or child or the sickness cast over a man or woman only affected individuals, but in a community of peasants a destructive storm brought suffering on everyone.

Controversy aroused by Tartarotti.

Tartarotti, Girolamo.—*Del Congresso Notturno delle Lammie. S'aggiungono due Dissertazioni Epistolari sopra l'Arte Magica.* Rovereto, 1749.

Tartarotti derives from Herodias—in connection with the Domina Abundia and goodwomen who ride at night—the Venetian custom at his time of quieting children by promising them Radódese will bring them presents, as she is said on the night of Epiphany to come down the chimney with presents for good children—a sort of Santa Claus.—Lib. i, c. 5, §7 (p. 23).

Vincent of Beauvais tells a story of an old woman who, to gain the favor of her priest, told him she had saved his life, for she had entered his house with the *Dominae Nocturnae* and, seeing him lying naked in bed, had covered him, for if the other *Dominae* had seen him they would have beaten him to death. He asked how she had entered his house and chamber, as they were both well locked, when she said they could pass through locked doors. He took her back to the sacristy, locked the door, beat her with a cross and told her to go out. She could not do so and when he opened the door and dismissed her he said, "You see what a fool you are in believing these vain dreams."—Ib., §8 (p. 24).

See Rather, bishop of Verona, Praeloquia, lib. i, tit. 4, n. 10 (which I have elsewhere—H. C. L.), for a third part of the world following Herodias.—Ib., §10 (p. 25).

Baronius (Annal., ann. 382, n. 20) states that in the Acts of St. Damasus (Pope 366–84), formerly recited in the churches, there is an account of a Roman Council in which among other things it was decreed "excommunicandos esse omnes maleficiis,

auguriis, sortilegiis omnibusque aliis superstitionibus vacantes; qua sententia praesertim foeminas illas plectendas esse quae illusae a daemone se putant noctu super animalia ferri atque una cum Herodiade circumvagari."—Ib., §11 (p. 26).

Of course this is long posterior to 382—and even to Regino—but it may indicate the source whence Burchard drew Herodias as an adjunct to Diana.

In 1716, in Tyrol, Maria Bertoletti was beheaded as a witch. In her confession her demon or Martinello, who accompanied her to the Sabbat, appeared "in forma bensì d'uomo, ma colle mani, piedi, corna e coda di caprone e di aspetto molto terribile."—Ib., c. 9, §10 (p. 57).

In 1728 there died in prison in Tyrol Maddalena Todeschi, who had been sentenced to perpetual confinement.—Ib., lib. iii, c. 14, §7 (p. 304).

In 1717 Domenica Pedrotti was beheaded and burnt as a witch near Rovereto.—Ib., lib. ii, c. 16, §5 (p. 186). There would have been several more executions, had not the women died in prison (p. 304).

Apparently the Roman Inquisition preserved its moderate course up to the date of Tartarotti's work, for after quoting the Instructions he applauds "l'odierna irreprensibil condotta di quel savissimo Tribunale."—Ib., lib. i, c. 10, §4 (p. 66).

He wastes a good deal of space, to the modern reader, in proving the impossibility of such rapid transport through the air and of demons performing the transport, but it was well suited to the time and to the intellects of the supporters of witchcraft.—Ib., lib. ii, c. 1, §§1–7 (pp. 73–89).

His reasoning as to the impossibilities of the Sabbat is well put and convincing, but thrown away upon those who could answer all arguments by saying that all the marvels were accomplished by the permission of God, whose omnipotence served as a universal solvent. To us, the interest of the discussion lies in the fact that statements of such elementary and self-evident truths should have been necessary in the middle of the eighteenth century.

Tartarotti gives a long extract from Friedrich Hoffmann's *Dissertatio de Diaboli Potentia in Corpora* in which the latter gives a medical diagnosis as to diabolical illusions.[1]—Ib., c. 5, §6 (p. 108).

Malebranche (1638–1715), in his work De Inquirenda Veritate, lib. ii, pt. 3, c. 6, conspicuously anticipated the future in saying "Ipsos plectere desinant, instar insanorum habeant,

[1] See below, pp. 1464–7.

tandem fiet ut nulli amplius reperiantur Venefici." And he continues, "Sapientissime igitur multa Parlamenta poenas non sumunt de Veneficis. In terris ipsorum jurisdictionis ejusmodi homines longe pauciores reperiuntur, et sceleratorum invidia, odium, ac malignitas id criminis praetendere non possunt ut innocentes opprimant."—Tartarotti, lib. ii, c. 7, §§2–3 (pp. 119–20).

Another writer quotes Malebranche as admitting the existence of witches and their just execution. See Animavversione Critiche, p. 151.

Tartarotti does not deny that the demon may have a hand in exciting the brain of the sleeper to the dreams of actions which she subsequently thinks that she has performed and thus is the author of the illusions respecting the Sabbat.—Ib., c. 9, §2 (p. 127).

But he leans rather to natural causes—melancholic temperament, inflamed imagination at the stories heard from others and the use of some narcotic unguent producing stupor.—Ib., §10 (pp. 133–4).

He adduces the public reading of the sentences as well as the details printed in a thousand books as a reason why the confessions tally so well, even in different lands—this concordance being one of the strongest arguments put forward by defenders of the belief. (For the weight ascribed to it see Del Rio, Disq. Mag., lib. v, sect. 16, vol. III, p. 769.—H.C.L.)

Malebranche says "Multi saepe extiterunt Venefici sinceri, hoc est qui se revera tales existimabant, qui omnibus ingenue nuntiabant se Sabbatum frequentare; idque tam alte imbiberant ut quamvis multi, postquam prope illos pernoctassent, affirmarent ipsos e lecto non egressos fuisse, ab illa tamen opinione dimoveri non poterant."—Tartarotti, lib. ii, c. 11, §4 (p. 141).

Denmark was no more enlightened or merciful than Germany. Tartarotti cites from the "Responsum Juris in ardua quadam causa" presented to the King of Denmark by his councillor Theodor Reinkingk (printed Giessen, 1662) the case of a girl of seventeen accused as a witch by her father and stepmother. There was no formal examination. In the preliminary extrajudicial examination she confessed; this confession was sent to have the sentence rendered; she was allowed no defence, but called before the court, where she confirmed the confession, and the sentence was published and at once executed, though she and her father begged for delay

in order to prepare her defence, and she wept and showed signs of repentance. It did not appear from the examination that she had injured men or beasts or had commerce with the demon. She varied, moreover, and contradicted herself; she said the witches could render themselves invisible in the Sabbat, but not elsewhere; that the assemblies were held in their houses; that they drew wine from the walls; and she named as seen in the Sabbat persons who had long been dead. On the strength of this evidence certain women were arrested, tried by water ordeal, tortured and finally were found dead in the prison.—Ib., c. 12, §5 (p. 155).

Tartarotti feels it necessary to disculpate the papacy, in order to meet the argument that belief in witchcraft is virtually an article of faith adopted by the Church in its head and its members. He points out that the bull *Summis desiderantes* is directed against the wicked acts of sorcerers and does not apply specially to witches and the same is the case with other papal utterances, and if Adrian VI and Clement VII allude to *haeresim Strigiatus* they simply relied upon the reports of the inquisitors. To Del Rio he attributes mainly the influence which fixed the belief so in the popular mind "che se il negarla non è ora così pericoloso come lo era una volta, è almeno presso la maggior parte degli uomini quanto negare la luce del Sole."—Ib., §7 (p. 158).

To carry out his argument he confines the definition of the Strega exclusively to those who are transported by the demon to the Sabbat where they adore him and renounce the faith—and thus we can understand why he entitled his book "Del Congresso Notturno delle Lammie."—Ib., c. 13, §3 (pp. 160–1).

He admits the reality of sorcery and pact—"L'effetto o buono o cattivo dal Mago per mezzo del Demonio prodotto, è vero e reale, e spesso a tutti palese; quello della Strega è ideato, immaginario ed occulto." "Il Mago comanda a Satanasso, la Strega ubbidisce." Theologians, jurists and philosophers and all, in conformity with divine and human laws, unitedly determine "che a pena di morte debbano soggiacere i Maghi." But the obedience of the devil to the sorcerer is only feigned to gain his adherence.—Ib., §4 (p. 161).

"Nella Magia tre voluntà concorrono: quella di Dio che permette, quella del Diavolo che opera, e quella del Mago che desidera e invita." But he does not adopt the opinion that the human agent is necessary for the devil to accomplish his evil purposes.—Ib., §8 (p. 163).

Witchcraft he holds to be a purely imaginary offence, hurtful to no one but the party herself. It may, indeed, merit punishment such as prison, exile, pillory, scourging or the like. The offence is that of the old illusioned followers of Diana, who were admonished charitably or treated medically. —Ib., §10 (pp. 165–6).

All this shows the fundamental weakness of his position. He could not controvert the truth of sorcery, taught from the time of Scripture down through all the authorities of the Church, and strong as his arguments were against witchcraft they could not carry conviction because directed solely against one development of the general superstition. When once the intrusion of the devil in human affairs through sorcery was admitted, there was nothing to prevent its extension to the Sabbat. Del Rio was more logical (Disq. Mag., lib. v, sect. 16, III, p. 756) when he rejected all such distinctions as unnatural, "pro iisdem sumens veneficos, maleficos, incantatores, sagas, striges, Lamias, . . . hac putida [distinguendi] diligentia praetermissa."

Just as Satan deceived our first parents with the promise that they should be as gods, so now he allures these poor ignorant women with the illusion of the power they can exercise and thus renders them his slaves.—Tartarotti, lib. ii, c. 14, §2 (p. 169).

"Uccisioni di uomini per via d'arte Magica non è da credere che Iddio ne permetta se non rarissime."—Ib., c. 16, §5 (p. 186).

He explains many things—admitting them and attributing them to illusions caused by the devil to confirm belief in sorcery.—Ib., §6 (pp. 188–9).

"Recando adunque le molte parole in una, abbiamo Venefici veri, e Venefici immaginarj, Maghi veri, e Maghi ideali, e di questi di due sorte: altri, che producono vero effetto; altri, che di quello son privi. I Venefici veri, e così i veri Maghi, come ancora gl'immaginarj, ma che vero effetto producono, possono certamente meritare la morte: non così i Venefici immaginarj, o i Maghi ideali non producenti effetto; alla qual ultima classe reducendosi le nostre Streghe, ne viene in conseguenza, che tutti i danni, e le morti, da esse liberamente deposte in giudizio, non sono sufficiente motivo per una pena capitale."—Ib., §8 (p. 190).

The imaginary sorceries which produce effects apparently are those in which the devil does the work and makes the sorcerer believe that it is his. He also describes how the devil, foreseeing something about to occur, as a tempest or a death, leads the sorcerer to work for it, in order to confirm the opinion of his power—and this perhaps is rather what he means by imag-

inary sorcerer producing effects. The passage is obscure and illustrates the weakness of his system, which concedes everything but the Sabbat. It is impossible for him, when conceding so much, to find logical arguments for denying this.

One injury arising from belief in the Sabbat is that its absurdity leads many into the opposite error of rejecting all sorcery and magic.—Ib., lib. iii, c. 3, §1 (p. 210).

Tartarotti quotes from Matthias Berlich the account of a peasant who, to discover witches, would put in a sack as many threads as there were women in the place and then, after reciting a charm, would beat the bag stoutly with a cudgel. Then, hastening from house to house, he would observe what women showed signs of being beaten. These would be arrested, tortured, forced to confess and be burnt, and in a single small district sixteen unfortunates thus perished.—Ib., c. 2, §7 (p. 207).

From what Tartarotti says it would appear that in his time belief in the Sabbat was almost universal and he draws a strong picture of the deplorable influence which it exercised on daily life when everyone felt himself exposed at any moment to the malignity of witches.—Ib., c. 3, §§4–5 (pp. 214–15).

L. A. Muratori in his treatise "Della forza della Fantasia umana," c. 10, says of the Sabbat: "Atribuir tanta forza a i Diavoli fra i Cristiani, da che il divino Salvator nostro soggiogò l'Inferno, è un far torto alla santa nostra Religione." And he denies incubi and succubi.—Ib., c. 14, §3 (p. 300).

Muratori says that these are "Opinioni oggidì in tal maniera screditate, che non v'ha più se non la gente rozza, che se le bee con facilità, e le crede, come fa di tant' altre vanissime relazioni e fole"—and Tartarotti wishes it were so, but it is not so.—Ib., §6 (p. 302).

Professore Gianrinaldo Carli, in a letter to Tartarotti, appended to the book, says that to his knowledge in Sclavonia, Istria, Dalmatia, Albania, the Levant, Venice, Friuli and elsewhere nothing is more common and more firmly believed by the women and the men of sluggish minds than witches, incantations, *malefizi* and the Sabbat.—Lettera, ib. p. 319.

Carli points out that conceding magic, based on pact and relations with the demon, there is no reason why it should not develop into witchcraft. If one is admitted, the other cannot be rejected. What is attributed to witches now is

the same as was of old attributed to sorcerers—and he thus indicates the fundamental weakness of Tartarotti's position. —Ib., p. 320.

To this Tartarotti replies in a long letter (pp. 353–447) in which he has no difficulty in proving to his satisfaction the reality of magic and sorcery from the Scripture, the common belief of mankind from the earliest ages, the consensus of opinion of the fathers and theologians and the long series of legislation from the imperial jurisprudence—and also that there is an essential distinction between witchcraft and sorcery.

ANON.—*Animavversioni Critiche sopra il Notturno Congresso delle Lammie. S'aggiugne il Discorso del P. Gaar sulla Strega d'Erbipoli, la Risposta dello stesso alle Note, il Ragguaglio sulla Strega di Salisburgo, e il Compendio Storico della Stregheria.* Venezia, 1751.

This anonymous work[1] is a confutation of Tartarotti's theory of a distinction between sorcery and witchcraft, proving them to be merely branches of the same evil magic and equally punishable. It was occasioned by Tartarotti's annotations on Father Gaar's sermon (see below, pp. 1453–6).

In his prefatory dedication the author expresses his object to be—"Il vero mezza dunque sembra, come ben vede l'Eccellenza Vostra, il richiamare a giusto esame, ed esatto criterio e la Magia, e la Stregheria, il ripurgarle dalle favolette, il separar il falso dal vero, e l'accordar, che il Demonio con chi ha perduta la coscienza e la fede, far può più di quel che figurar ci possiamo, benchè di rado permesso gli venga da Dio d'esercitar tal potenza a danno degli uomini."—Preface, p. 2.

He cannot see why witches should not be capitally punished, even if guilty of nothing more than renouncing baptism, adoring the demon, perverting others and inducing to join their impious society and abusing sacred things.—Animavversioni, n. 5 (p. 5).

Pierre Gassendi (1592–1655) casts doubt on the Sabbat in speaking of the flight being imaginary when the women are asleep at home and on waking assert themselves to have been there; but he does not wholly deny it—"persaepe vix quidquam veri est quod reperias."—Ib., n. 7 (p. 8).

Cardinal Caietano, in his commentary on the Summa of Aquinas, sec. sec., q. 95, art. 3, says "rarissime videtur accidere"; and he naturally accepts, with his author, the existence

[1] Now known to be by a Franciscan, P. Benedetto Bonelli (1704–83).

of incubi. In this passage Caietano, after relating the adventures of certain women who after inunction believed themselves to be transported "ad ludos Dianae, ad domum dilecti, in alienam cameram," etc., and after stating "sunt haec in imaginatione, imaginatio fuit," etc., adds: "Per haec tamen non negamus quin Diabolus, Deo permittente, quandoque personam aliquam voluntariam, etiam corporaliter ducat de loco ad locum, sed hoc rarissime videtur accidere."—Ib., n. 8 (p. 9).

It is significant of the temper of the demonologists that in 1751 the author remarks that if, as Pomponazio asserts, Cecco d'Ascoli was inclined to deny the existence of demons, "questo solo, per mio avviso, bastar può per argomentar se meritato abbia o nò tal supplizio."—Ib., n. 15 (p. 14).

Which seems at least to imply that such incredulity merited burning.

Speaks with high praise of Del Rio's *opera celeberrima* and warmly defends him, in spite of some errors.—Ib., n. 17 (p. 16).

Long discourse to prove the reality of incubi and succubi, for which he collects with great industry a perfect cloud of witnesses, commencing with St. Augustin.—Ib., nn. 19–27 (pp. 18–25).

Then takes up the Can. Episcopi, which of course "refers to a different sect from the modern witches."—Ib., nn. 28–33 (pp. 25–35).

It is scarce worth while to follow him in the long discussion over the power of demons to move bodies, and other details. More to the purpose is his attack on Tartarotti's weak spot of the distinction between magic and witchcraft.

He commences with a long quotation from Maffei, whom he terms, "gran Letterato e lume della nostra Italia." In the Arte Magica dileguata, p. 21 (2d ed.), Maffei says, "Ha fatto stupire il nuovo assunto che non si danno Streghe, ma che si danno Maghe; che Stregherie non ci sono, ma che ci sono Magie Diaboliche: questo sembra a molti che sia un affermare e negare nell' istesso tempo sotto diversi nomi l'istessa cosa. . . . Se nell' una e nell' altra intervengono cose prodigiose e queste per opera del Demonio, l'essenza loro è l'istessa. Arbitrario e contradittorio è il dir poi che il Mago agisce e la Strega nò; che il Mago comanda a Satanasso, la Strega ubbidisce; che l'effetto del Mago è vero, e quello della Strega immaginario; che nella Magia intervengono i veri patti

espressi o taciti, e che quelli della Stregheria vani sono ed immaginarj." Maffei goes on to point out pitilessly the inconsistencies of the position, which Weyer had already taken two hundred years before and it had been sufficiently shown what difficulties such doctrine contained. "Anzi chi tiene e propugna la realtà e la forza della Magia, molto difficilmente può negare anche l'entrar ne' luoghi chiusi e l'esser portate per aria a 'notturni congressi. Non serve pretendere tali cose impossibili alle forze umane. . . . Anche la differenza de'castighi voluta nel Libro, rigore usando co' Maghi e indulgenza con le Streghe, non so quanto sussista. . . . Sapendosi per modo d'esempio che sciocca persona, fatto un figurino lo punga e lo ferisca di tanto in tanto, mormorando ridicole parole, come sapremo se tal fattura provenga de Stregoneria ò da Magia? E però se la punizione abbia da esser mite ò severa?"—Animavversioni, n. 48 (pp. 56–8).

In the canonization proceedings of St. Antonino it is related that he "Magistrum Joannem de Cavibus dictum, Magicum et Nicromantum post canonicas monitiones ac debitum examen et justum suae condemnationis processum, dimisit in manu Curiae saecularis; a qua publice demum in sua pertinacia perseverans fuit combustus."—Ib., n. 49, p. 60.

Shows episcopal jurisdiction and that there was no fear of incurring irregularity. Doubtless the "pertinacity" was merely denial of guilt.

The enormous number of authorities piled up by the writer to prove the identity of sorcery and witchcraft—classical poets and legists, theologians, canonists, jurists, historians and hagiological legends—suggests the reflection that in the early days of the witchcraft craze, while the Cap. Episcopi was recognized as an authority, the effort of the demonologists was to prove that witchcraft was a new heretical sect and therefore not subject to its animadversions; while, after demonologists had argued the canon away, they labored to show that witchcraft was known to the ancients, and that the cruel imperial laws were directed against it. Protestant divines and Catholic theologians agreed that the Mechassepha of Exodus was the modern witch and that in strangling or burning her they were merely obeying the command of God.

The writer tells of St. Carlo Borromeo's persecution of the witches of the Valle Mescolina (Grisons) and the burning of the unfortunate Provost of Rovereto (which I believe I have elsewhere—H. C. L.). He also refers to another persecution in 1588 by Cardinal Valerio, Bishop of Verona, who had found in his diocese a number whom he describes in a pastoral letter of December 15, 1588, "che hanno fatto patto con l'inferno, cioè col Demonio infernale, capital nemico dell'anime, atten-

dendo a superstizioni, a incanti, a stregarie, ed a simili abbominazioni" and others who were "uomini ignoranti e infelici, e anco superstiziosissime e vanissime donnicciuole," all of whom should be denounced to the Inquisitor.—Ib., n. 58 (p. 76).

The writer is pitiless. He says that it is not credible that anyone should argue that, if witches in the hands of the ecclesiastical power, whose chief object is the reformation of souls, should repent, the just rigor of the law should be tempered and their lives should be spared, especially in case of voluntary confession and abandonment of their evil ways—and that capital punishment should be reserved for those guilty of diabolical *maleficium* or of relapse. In support of this he quotes the jurists who say that the repentant witch is to be beheaded and the persistent one is to be burned alive; while others add that those guilty of intercourse with incubi, even if there is no express pact, must be burnt.—Ib., n. 59 (pp. 77–8).

He asks who can deny that capital punishment is due to those who abuse the sacraments? If a "Moderno" exclaims that it is incredible that the body of our Lord can serve to kill infants, to bring sickness, to destroy harvests and to render husbands impotent, he replies that it is not the Eucharist but its abuse that enables the demon to slay souls, and he quotes the well-known text "qui manducat et bibit indigne, judicium sibi manducat et bibit . . . reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini" (as if that had any bearing on the case—H. C. L.).—Ib., p. 79.

So in discussing the bull of Gregory XV, decreeing relaxation when death has been occasioned, but when it has not "debeat perpetuis carceribus mancipari," he points out that this does not forbid capital punishment; if it had been the papal intention to do so he would have said "debeat tantum" etc.—Ib., p. 80.

In this I suppose he is justified under the rule which prescribes the strictest interpretation of papal decrees.

To a good Catholic, the argument for the reality of witchcraft is unanswerable—"Ed in vero sarebbesi per avventura la stessa Ecclesiastica Podestà usurpato il potere di formar giudizial processo contra le Streghe, se la Stregheria delitto fosse meramente ideale ed interno?"—Ib., p. 84.

And this is as forcible today as in the eighteenth century! It serves to explain the difficulty of the reformers and the energy with which they were

combated and the virulence of the defence. They were the "Modernists" of the eighteenth century, though, as they did not threaten the foundations on which the power of the Church is built, they escaped excommunication and the penalties consequent thereon.

He asks, "Does not the denial of the existence of demons open the way and lead directly to the denial of the existence of God?"—Ib., n. 68 (p. 92).

The influence on demons of cocks' crowing is, says the writer, as old as Prudentius (348–94), who says, Hymn. 1 (q. v.):

"Ferunt, vagantes Daemonas,
Laetos tenebris noctium,
Gallo canente exterritos
Sparsim timere et cedere."

Remy tells us (Daemonolatreia, l. i, c. 14, nn. 55–9, ed. Colon. Agrip., 1596, p. 108) of a witch who stated that nothing more unfortunate could happen than to have a cock crow while they were preparing to fly to the Sabbat and two others who said that at the Sabbat, when the time for departure approached, their Magistelli would tell them to "hasten for the cocks are beginning to crow," whence Remy concludes that it could not be continued beyond that signal, and he goes on to speculate as to the cause. Del Rio (Disq. Mag., l. vi, c. 2, §1, q. 1, p. 926) describes as a superstition the belief that the crowing of a cock dissipates some *maleficia*. He refers to Remy and says that, if there is truth in what he states, he would attribute it to the demons hating the cock-crow on account of some mystery odious to them.

And the writer of the Animavversioni virtually accepts this mystery.—Animavv. Crit., n. 70 (p. 94).

He tells us that in Germany, at the beginning of summer, on every Sunday, in the processions of the Sacrament, the chanting of the first verses of the four gospels is followed by the prayer, "Per hos sermones Sancti Evangelii D. N. J. C. indulgeat nobis Dominus universa delicta nostra, ac defendat, custodiat et protegat omnes vineas et agros atque fructus nostros ab omnibus infestationibus Daemonum, Incantatorum maleficiis et laesionibus tempestatum." This custom, decried by Luther, is warmly defended by the learned Jesuit Gretser, who also tells us that a carved cross affixed to the door of a house is an effective protection against sorceries.—Ib., p. 95.

When Tartarotti says that God does not always permit the wicked to effect their evil intentions, nor leave us perpetually

under the power of our enemies, his critic exclaims that this is reasoning to be laughed at rather than confuted.—Ib., p. 95.

Tartarotti assumes for Del Rio credit for lying when he related what he knew to be false about the famous black dog of Cornelius Agrippa, everywhere by demonologists assumed to be a familiar demon, whom on his death-bed he dismissed, saying, "Go, accursed beast who hast led me to perdition," whereupon the dog rushed to a neighboring stream and disappeared under the water (Congr. Notturno, lib. iii, c. 10, p. 270). The critic takes Tartarotti gravely to task for this insult to Del Rio and professes himself unwilling to decide as to the truth or falsity of Agrippa's dog. Weyer (De Praestigiis Daemonum, ii, c. 5, nn. 11–12), who was a disciple of Agrippa's, defends his master's memory. The dog was a dog and nothing more, though Agrippa's affection for it was excessive, leading him to have it alongside of him at table and to share his bed. The dog had the French name of Monsieur.—Animavv. Crit., n. 72 (p. 99).

This, when translated into Dominus, may perhaps have given some color to the belief that Agrippa regarded it as a superior being, though he provided it with a black female companion, which he characteristically called Mademoiselle.

That Del Rio's credulity was quite sufficient to accept the demonic character of the dog is seen in his gravely relating (Disquis. Mag., ii, q. 29, sect. 1, p. 309) how Agrippa was obliged to fly from Louvain. During a short absence he confided to his wife the key of his cabinet, with strict orders to allow no one to enter it. A young student of Agrippa's overpersuaded her and she lent him the key. He picked up a book of conjurations and began reading; there came a thrice repeated knocking at the door which he did not answer, when it was broken open and a demon entered, demanding to know why he had been summoned; the student was too terrified to answer, so the demon fell upon him and strangled him. On Agrippa's return he saw the demons capering in triumph on his roof and on summoning them he learned what had occurred. He promptly ordered one of them to enter the corpse and walk it around the marketplace among the students and then abandon it. When it was picked up, the marks of strangulation were recognized; the affair was investigated and Agrippa escaped to Lorraine.

See also (about the dog), Bodin, De Mag. Daem., lib. ii, c. 1.

Taking it altogether the *Animavversioni* is a work of wide and varied learning. As a zealous Catholic the author cannot but defend all the superstitions of witchcraft—the Sabbat, the union with incubi and the other details, which have the support of so long a line of famous theologians and papal utterances. Yet it is somewhat surprising to find, in the middle of the eighteenth century, so warm a defence of Del Rio against the attacks of Tartarotti. He admits that Del Rio is sometimes uncritically credulous in accepting facts on insufficient authority, but the confidence with which

he continually cites him in support of his argument shows how profound and durable was the impression made by the Disquisitiones Magicae. And, though he is familiar with Spee and knows the Instructions of the Roman Inquisition, he is careful not to allude to the atrocities of the witch-trials.

He not infrequently cites Carpzov, which shows how much evil such a man could do in his inconsiderate zeal.

It would seem that Maffei's work (*Arte Magica Dileguata*, Verona, 1749) was called forth by Tartarotti's book, for Tartarotti answered him in an *Apologia del Congresso notturno delle Lammie, o sia Riposta all'Arte Magica Dileguata di S. Maffei ed all'opposizione di B. Melchiori.* Venezia, 1751 (Grässe, p. 30). The latter work cannot be the *Animavversioni* which I have analyzed above, as in this there are occasional allusions to a second book of Tartarotti's, presumably the *Apologia.*

[In the year when Tartarotti's book appeared, but too late for mention in it, occured Germany's last notable witch-burning, that of the subprioress Maria Renata, at Würzburg, June 21, 1749.] Father George Gaar, S. J., preached a sermon at the execution. Of this three editions appeared in Germany and it was translated and printed in Italy. Then a printer reprinted this with a brief series of critical remarks by Tartarotti. These were circulated in Germany and Gaar translated them into Latin and printed them with his answers. This was printed, together with an Italian version of the Sermon, as an appendix to the anonymous attack (*Animavversioni Critiche*) on Tartarotti's *Notturno Congresso.* It is followed further by a *Ragguaglio Sincero* respecting the recent execution of a witch at Salzburg and this again by a *Corollario Storico sopra la Stregheria.*

The character of Father Gaar's mind is indicated in the Preface to his *Responsa ad Annotationes Criticas Dr. F. A. T. in Sermonem de Maria Renata.* In this he deplores the innovations which are calling in question the wisdom of the past: "We seem to have a new heaven, new elements, a new system of the world, while those old opinions which before our times were scarce the subject of doubt are laughed at and exploded with an unjust sentence of falsehood and error."—Gaar, Responsa (Animavv. Crit., p. 127).

The condemnation of the Copernican System was still in force and Gaar might well shelter himself under it, for the movement of the spheres by angels in the geocentric theory was one of the principal arguments for the transportation of witches to the Sabbat.

1. Tartarotti's first annotation is directed against incubi and the power of transportation ascribed to demons. In his answer Gaar seems to think it sufficient to quote Del Rio, the Malleus, Binsfeld, Aquinas, Carpzov, Suarez and other authorities and the customary Scripture texts. He admits, however, that the flight to the Sabbat is sometimes imaginary. —Ib., pp. 128–32.

2. Tartarotti's second annotation argues that, if witchcraft is a delusion and not comprehended under magic, the old texts and laws do not apply to it, and do not prove Maria Renata to have been worthy of death; for Prierias, Spina, Bernard of Como and others agree that it is great injustice to put witches to death who are guilty only in imagination. Gaar replies this goes beyond the question, for Maria was a *maleſica* and was condemned as such. Then he proceeds at much length to argue that witchcraft is merely one of the species of magic and he asks whether the assumption that it is imaginary is derived from heaven or hell.—Ib., pp. 133–6.

Bear in mind the weakness of Tartarotti's position, accepting magic and denying witchcraft.

3. Tartarotti's third annotation is that the temptation exceeded the strength of a young girl, while St. Paul says that God will not permit us to be tempted beyond our strength. Gaar replies that it is perfectly credible that Maria should be led into magic at the age of six or seven. Does not St. Gregory (Dialog. iv, 18) tell of a boy of five damned for blasphemy and does not God permit children to die unbaptized and forfeit heaven?—Ib., pp. 136–7.

4. Tartarotti's annotation is "Non fallit Anagramma. Daemon iste in quodam Germaniae Gymnasio studiis operam dederit, ubi Cannochiale Aristotelicum Emmanuelis Thesauri magno in pretio est." Not very intelligible and Gaar dismisses it as unworthy of attention.—Ib., p. 137.

5. Tartarotti's annotation is that witches confess many crimes, but the difficulty is whether such confessions are true. Gives cases. The question hinges on whether the Sabbat is an illusion; if so, the crimes confessed along with it are imaginary. Gaar replies the confessions are often false and witches lie about those they say are their associates, but not so easily as to their own misdeeds. Quotes Carpzov that even when all is illusory they are subject to punishment on account of renouncing God, pact with Satan, and believing themselves to have done these things, thus giving consent. Quotes Godelmann as to Saxon laws burning them, even if they have harmed no one.—Ib., pp. 138–9.

6. Tartarotti's annotation is that atheists admit the existence of witches; the thousands burnt have not converted them to believe in God and the devil, and the case of Maria Renata will not do so. If it did, it would not be credible

that God would permit such a thing for that purpose. Gaar calls atheists brutes, but argues that the witchcraft by which men are possessed by demons confounds the unbeliever and God permits it for that purpose.—Ib., pp. 140–1.

7. Tartarotti's annotation is that out of a thousand whom we call energumens there is scarce one really possessed. That they are relieved by prayers and exorcisms only proves that an imaginary affection is benefited by imaginary remedies inspiring hope and belief. Refers to case of Maria Volet in Le Brun, vol. IV.[1] It were to be wished that Father Gaar had adduced more proof of the possession of the nuns, for the confession of Maria Renata is insufficient. To this Gaar replies that he admits that often many thought to be possessed are not so. But he knows the proofs stated by Thyraeus and others and these were found in some of the nuns of Cella Dei, so that they were properly judged by prudent men to be possessed. It pleased God to show the riches of his divine goodness and within a year of Maria's execution, through exorcisms, the infernal enemies at last were forced to abandon their lodgings and with scarce an exception all the energumens were liberated.—Ib., pp. 141–2.

8. Tartarotti's eighth annotation is that, if witchcraft is imaginary, the witch is rather bewitched than bewitching; she is not an actor but a sufferer, she hurts none save herself [and] the associates whom she has enticed; God therefore could not, from this second motive, have permitted the *maleficia* of Maria Renata to be manifested to the world. Gaar rejoins that if the sky should fall we would catch larks; if Christ only spoke figuratively "hoc est corpus meum," he is not present in the Eucharist and he adduces other analogies to show that from one absurdity another follows. The figment ascribed to witchcraft is an absurdity, and, as this is the foundation of Tartarotti's argument, it all falls.—Ib., pp. 142–3.

9. Tartarotti's ninth annotation is that, presupposing that God permitted this case to terrify unbelievers and magi, the necessary conclusion would be that Maria was justly put to death. But this supposition labors under many other difficulties and so the third motive alleged is shaken. Gaar replies that this shows the great audacity of the annotation, thus publicly casting doubt on the justice of the Würzburg tribunal. Who is he that he constitutes himself a judge over

[1] His Histoire critique des pratiques superstitieuses.

judges? The difficulties he alleges exist only in his fancy and the third motive is unshaken.—Ib., p. 143.

10. Tartarotti's tenth annotation says that, if it were permissible to interpret the will of God at one's pleasure, this case might be adduced to show that it was permitted by God to make everyone see how chimerical is the union of witches with demons, over which for three or four centuries all the courts of Europe have been crazy, and he goes on with an eloquent plea for charity. Gaar asks whether this deserves an answer; if he were silent, all the courts of Europe, which he accuses of imprudence, injustice and cruelty, would rise against the accuser—and much more of the same sort, invoking the testimony of all the theologians, canonists and jurists, including Carpzov.—Ib., pp. 143–5.

11. Tartarotti's eleventh annotation is that many doctors who regard the union with demons as real agree that it deserves punishment, but not death, especially if there is repentance. Gaar replies that this is a matter outside of his jurisdiction and for the courts. He is not willing to be the advocate of witches and magi. As for those who interpret in their favor the Cap. Episcopi and urge only salutary penalties he quotes at length from Del Rio and Carpzov.—Ib., pp. 145–6.[1]

Following this in the same volume is a *Ragguaglio sincero su la Sentenza di Morte in Salisburgo ultimamente seguita contra una Strega.*

This is a further attack on Tartarotti. It commences by asserting that one of the greatest impediments to belief in these matters is the opinion that the Advent of Christ deprived the devil of all power over the human race. To show the fallacy of this the writer considers his power over the unbaptized and points out that this is the reason why he induces witches and magi to renounce their baptism and Christ so that he can take possession of them and exercise his tyranny without restraint.—Animavvers., p. 149.

Goes on with an immense list of authorities to prove the consensus of opinion on the power of the devil, on incubi, on transport through the air (including some contemporaneous instances related to the writer). Returns to incubi and sagely remarks, "Il dir poi, che per simil azione non basti un corpo aereo ed apparente, ma necessario sia un corpo vero ed ani-

[1] As to the documents for the case of Maria Renata see *Amer. Hist. Review*, XXXVI, p. 371, (July, 1931).

mato, non potrà giammai dimostrarsi" (which, taken literally, is true enough—H. C. L.).—Ib., pp. 149–63.

There is a charming simplicity in the argument, "Let no one argue that witches multiply when they are most severely punished, because, if on this account their punishment ought to cease, similarly all the exorcisms of holy Church on the obsessed ought to be abandoned because the number of energumens augments with the multiplication of exorcists."—Ib., p. 165.

All this collection of authorities is for the purpose of establishing the justice of the execution in 1749 at Salzburg of Anna Maria Baverin and at Neumarkt of her *magistra*, a sempstress of Bavaria (pp. 168, sqq.)—(which I think I have elsewhere—H. C. L.).

Burning of witches under St. Carlo Borromeo (pp. 173 sqq.)—(which I also think I have elsewhere—H. C. L.).

This *Ragguaglio* is followed by a *Corollario Storico sopra la Stregheria*, to prove that not simply magic but witchcraft was known and dreaded from the earliest times—quoting Scripture, Plato, the Latin poets, the imperial laws and those of the Barbarians, including Charlemagne.—Animavversioni, pp. 177–8.

The writer admits that St. Johannes Damascenus characterizes as follies and fables what is popularly ascribed to Strigae—"eas per aerem conspici, pueros suffocare, hepar infantium vorare, vitae terminos definire, occlusis foribus domos ingredi cum corpore vel nuda anima quando libuerit," etc. (which at all events shows the existing popular belief—H. C. L.). He does not deny the power of demons, but prescribes very narrow limits to it determined by nature and subjects it to divine permission.—Ib., p. 179.

Argues that Cap. Episcopi relates to a frivolous fable and has no bearing on witchcraft—discreetly makes no allusion to its incorporation by Gratian.—Ib., pp. 179–80.

The whole of this little essay is directed to proving that modern witchcraft has been known from the earliest times and is no novelty (as asserted by Nider and the Malleus). He lays especial stress on Innocent VIII's *Summis desiderantes*—but omits to mention that it says nothing about the Sabbat. The spread of Wickliffism and Hussitism he attributes largely to Zyto, the magician of Wenceslas. He speaks courteously of Tartarotti's *Notturno Congresso* as a work of vast learning, useful in rendering more cautious the tribunals

in prosecutions of witches, but he finds it hard to understand how the author can treat sorcery as a real crime worthy of the penalties decreed by law and yet deem witchcraft a figment of crazed brains and therefore exempt from the death penalty. —Ib., p. 186.

Wherein he touches the vital weakness of Tartarotti and the ineffectual character of his labors.

Simon, Jordanus (under the pseudonym of Ardoino Ubbidente dell' Osa).—*Die Nichtigkeit der Hexerey und Zauberkunst.* Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1766. 2. ed.

Whether there was a first edition and when published does not appear.[1] Grässe (p. 114) gives only this, which is what I have. Simon also in 1767 printed a defence of Maria Teresa's decree on the witch-process. The *Nichtigkeit* caused quite a controversy, P. Angelus März being a vigorous writer on the other side (Grässe, p. 65) and P. Sterzinger using Simon's arguments effectively.

Père Simon, in his address to the reader, announces that his object is to prove that sorcery is "ein grosses und Weltbetrügendes Nichts" and he concludes his book with the conclusion, "Die heutige Zauberkunst und Hexerey ist ein grosses Welt-betrügendes Nichts." His first idea was to translate the two books of the immortal Maffei, but he abandoned this because it would have necessitated also translating Tartarotti's book, to which they were an answer; he has used Maffei's arguments and proofs and added his own since he felt bound to mention the spring from which he had drunk, so that he might not be accused of plagiarism.

Père Simon makes good use of the argument (after Maffei) that Christ destroyed the devil's power, and he calls attention to the fact that nowhere in the Gospels is there any reference to sorcery or sorcerers and that St. Paul, in his animadversions on all human sins, never includes sorcery. In the Acts there is mention of two sorcerers (Elymas, or Bar-Jesus, Acts, xiii, 6–8, and Simon Magus, Acts, viii, 9), and this is the only allusion in the New Testament.—Nichtigkeit der Hexerey, p. 123.

None of the demons ejected by Christ is said to have been put in possession by sorcery.

Simon takes the ground, from numerous passages in Scripture, which I have elsewhere, that the self-sacrifice of Christ

[1] The work first appeared under the title *Das Welt-betrügende Nichts*, Würzburg, 1761.

deprived the devil of power. But he confines this to the power of aiding sorcerers to fulfil their evil desires and by false miracles to pervert them from the worship of the true God. He still has power to tempt men and to enter into possession of their bodies.—Ib., p. 100.

How does this accord with the Apocalyptic imprisonment in hell, which he elsewhere triumphantly cites, explaining that the one thousand years means an indefinite time and that it is to last—as the text says—till the coming of Antichrist?

Taken as a whole the book is a logical and moderately written disproof of sorcery and witchcraft, under the limitations of a good Catholic. These limitations are especially suggested in the special pleading which pervades the sections devoted to proving from the utterances and usages of the Church that it has never in any way accepted or asserted belief in the reality of sorcery and witchcraft. There is a certain amount of *suppressio veri* and *suggestio falsi* in the emphasis laid on Cap. Episcopi and the careful avoidance of any discussion of Innocent VIII's bull *Summis desiderantes*.

Controversy Aroused by Sterzinger

Riezler attributes the dissipation of the witch-craze in Bavaria to the Theatin Don Ferdinand Sterzinger, the head of the convent of his Order in Munich. As a member of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences (founded in 1759) he read a paper, October 13, 1766, on the subject which awakened general interest and provoked discussion. He said he owed it to the Can. Episcopi that for some twelve years he had begun to doubt the truth of witchcraft. He saw in this that the old Church had condemned the belief as a superstition and he proceeded to expose the unworthy conception of God which it implied. Yet he could not admit that the thousands of witches who had been burnt were innocent. "Did they not deserve death who blasphemed God, worshipped the devil, killed innocent children and exhumed corpses in order to injure their neighbors?"—Hexenprozesse in Bayern, pp. 298–300.

Sterzinger admitted that most of his material was drawn from the work of Maffei and his German translator Dell'Osa (Father Jordan Simon, Augustinian).—Ib., p. 301.

His discourse awakened a lively controversy in which all classes, from the learned to the lower orders, took part, known as the "bayerische Hexenkrieg."—Ib., p. 302.

His first antagonist was the Augustinian P. Agnellus Merz, a fellow member of the Academy and of its committee of censorship which passed upon the printing of communications. He issued anonymously in 1766 his "Urtheil ohne Vorurtheil

über die wirkend- und thätige Hexerei," in which he had no difficulty in proving the existence of its marvels from Scripture, the schoolmen and the papal bulls.—Ib., p. 303.

Sterzinger answered in 1767 with his "Betrügende Zauberkunst und träumende Hexerei." Then Jacob Anton Kollmann, a priest, followed in 1768 with his anonymous "Zweifel eines Bayers über die wirkende Zauberkunst und Hexerei"—a spirited work, none the less effective that it assumed the position of an impartial doubter. Father Merz defended himself in 1767 with "Vertheidigung wider die geschwulstige Vertheidigung der betrügenden Zauberkunst."—Ib., pp. 304–5.

It is astonishing how, at the bold summons of Sterzinger, defenders of his position, lay and clerical, sprang from the ground. Evidently they had long cherished these opinions, but required a leader to encourage their expression. The conservatives also did not lack champions and battle was joined along the whole line.—Ib., p. 305.

In all no less than 28 controversial tracts were printed for and against Sterzinger's discourse.—Ib., p. 309.

One of his opponents was Father Angelus März, a Benedictine of the Abbey Scheiern. It boasted a particle of the true cross stained with Christ's blood and did a thriving business in selling small metal crosses which were touched to this particle and had a great reputation as protectors from sorcery and witches. März boasted that they were in great demand not merely in Bavaria but in Austria, Swabia, Bohemia, Moravia, Hungary, Saxony and Poland, so that the sale sometimes amounted to 40,000 a year.—Ib., p. 307.

Finally a command from the throne put an end to the controversy. Although Sterzinger's discourse contained nothing that had not long before been put forward, still it gave an incredible impetus to enlightenment in Bavaria. Yet so long as witchcraft figured in the criminal law the danger of prosecutions was not removed. In 1769 an "Introduction to the Malefizinquisitionsprocess" according to the practice under the new "Kriminalkodex" (apparently not official) accepts all the system of the Mall. Malef. except that it treats commerce with incubi as imaginary. The witch is to be shaved all over and carefully inspected for the witchmark. An elaborate scheme of suggestive questions is furnished to the judge, and another to be used with children.—Ib., pp. 312–13.

Yet after this we hear nothing of witch-prosecutions in Bavaria, and as, in the condition of public opinion, they would have excited attention, this silence is sufficient proof that they ceased a half-century before the laws were changed. To Sterzinger is due the credit of this change in public opinion and he continued the work under the Elector Karl Theodor (1777–99) against the superstition of ghosts, in spite of the clamor and accusations of heresy which assailed him. He died in 1787, after which Prof. J. Weber in Dillingen took the field and was opposed by "Ein katholischer Weltmann," who again was answered by "Ein anderer katholischer Weltmann zu Augsburg" in his "Was hält man anderswo von Hexerei, Zauberei, Gespenstern, Amuleten, Ignazibohnen und geweihten Kräutern?"—Ib., pp. 314–16.

The Carmelite Father Astery of Straubing issued cards in which he forbade Satan or witches to enter a house, and there were few dwellings in Straubing and its vicinage that had not on the door one of the cards, which were sold for a pound of butter. A Franciscan Friar, Benno, told a peasant-woman of Neuberg that her cows were bewitched by her mother-in-law, whom she should beat with a club till the blood came, and with it smear her cows to cure them. The advice was followed so energetically that the mother-in-law died; the woman was tried for murder, but the judge considered Benno to be the real culprit. It required a military demonstration to compel the spiritual authorities to punish him, when he was sentenced to ten years confinement in a convent on bread and water.—Ib., pp. 316–17.

With the reign of Maximilian IV Joseph (1799–1825) there dawned a new day. The secularization of church property (1803) wiped out the last refuge of doctrinal belief in witchcraft—the houses of the Mendicant Orders. Torture was abolished July 7, 1806, and the new criminal code, published October 1, 1813, after years of labor, has in it nothing about heresy, witchcraft or magic, save that a clause provides that the abuse of religion or religious matters to deceive is classed as theft and to be punished accordingly.—Ib., pp. 318–19.

Sterzinger, as a Tyrolese, comes also under Rapp's consideration. He was born in 1721 at Lichtwörth, near Rattenberg, entered the Theatine Order, distinguished himself by his learning and taught Morals, Philosophy and Canon Law at Prague and Munich. When the Elector of Bavaria, Maximilian Joseph, in 1759, founded the Academie der Wissen-

schaften at Munich he was among the first members, and subsequently became its Director of the Historical Class and entrusted with its censorship. In the celebrated discourse which he read in 1766 he argued against the existence of witchcraft. Christ has destroyed the kingdom of Satan; in the canon law the Sabbat was pronounced an evident illusion; among the prayers of the Roman Ritual, prescribed for all cases and occasions, there was not a single one against the black art of sorcerers and witches. Many things deemed to be sorcery and witchcraft were only natural occurrences, calling not for exorcisms and benedictions, but for investigation by unprejudiced persons or by physicians. The impression produced by this address was tremendous; as described by Count Joh. Zech, a member of the Academy, at a meeting held in commemoration of Sterzinger, February 22, 1787, it took his hearers so by surprise that they could scarce believe their ears and they hastened home and sharpened their pens to controvert him. People everywhere called him a wanton mocker, a blasphemer of religion. Among the peasantry the mere name Sterzinger aroused wrath; he was the universal object of calumny; in vain he sought protection against calumny among the most righteous.—Rapp, Hexenprozesse in Tirol, pp. 108–11.

When Sterzinger's discourse was printed it was promptly answered in two works—one by the Augustinian Agnellus März[1] and the other by the Benedictine Angelus März, who assert the reality of the Sabbat and of the power of witches to damage men and cattle and harvests.—Ib., pp. 113–14.

Sterzinger replied in a little book, "Betrügende Zauberkunst und träumende Hexerey, oder Vertheidigung der akademischen Rede von dem gemeinen Vorurtheile der wirkenden und thätigen Hexerey," München, 1767, in which he showed what an injury it was to religion to ascribe such powers to the devil and what a modern conception was the pact.—Ib., p. 115.

The difficulty with Sterzinger was that, while he appealed to reason with much force and ability, he was reduced to evasions in arguing away the constant tradition of the Church and the Fathers as to the reality of magic powers and of pact between men and demons. It required uncommon independence in a churchman to do this, and his adversaries had him at a disadvantage. But Sterzinger was not an independent investigator and borrowed nearly all he had to say from P. Jordan Simon, who, under the pseudonym of Ardoino Ubbidente dell' Osa, printed in 1761 his big

[1] Or Merz. See notes on Riezler, pp. 1459–60.

book at Frankfurt, "Das grosse weltbetrügende Nichts, oder die heutige Hexerey und Zauberkunst[1]" (Rapp, p. 121). It was difficult to meet the argument that so many learned and intelligent and conscientious Church Fathers and popes and theologians and lawgivers and judges should for centuries have accepted and acted upon the reality of sorcery and magic; and Sterzinger's opponents had at the time the victory over the Devil's Advocate, as they styled him.

The two monks März were not his only antagonists. The jurist Joh. Mich. Model wrote a pamphlet, P. Beda Schallhammer a thick quarto in Latin (Dissertatio de Magia nigra, Straubing, 1769)—and there were numerous others. On the other hand, he did not lack defenders, who however (which is significant) wrote anonymously or pseudonymously. P. Angelus März was a Benedictine of Scheiern, a convent which enjoyed a revenue from the annual sale of some 40,000 little crosses which had the reputation of amulets against sorcery—a fact which was not lost to sight in the controversy. It might have lasted longer, had not the Elector of Bavaria commanded it to cease. When Maria Theresa restricted the prosecution and allowed no more condemnations, the complaints as to magic and witchcraft died out of themselves. Joseph, a younger half-brother of Ferdinand Sterzinger, and like him a Theatin, printed anonymously "Der Hexenprozess, ein Traum, erzählt von einer unparteyischen Feder im Jahre 1767".—Ib., pp. 124–8.

Sterzinger also took part in a controversy over the wonder-cures of a priest named Joh. Joseph Gassner, who in 1758 was parish priest of Klösterle, a village at the foot of the Arlberg. Holding the belief that disease was often the work of the devil, he undertook cures by exorcisms with such success that invalids flocked from all quarters to him. The Bishop of Chur investigated his methods and approved of them. The Bishop of Regensburg, Anton Ignaz von Fugger, made him his chaplain and councillor and he settled in Ellwangen, where the concourse was so great that in 1774 more than 2700 pilgrims sought his aid. He set forth his views in books which excited animadversion. From Ellwangen he moved to Regensburg, where the same scenes were enacted. At last the imperial court intervened and ordered the Bishop of Regensburg to put an end to his work; the Bavarian government forbade his writings, and the Archbishops of Prague and Salzburg in pastorals warned their clergy against him. The

[1] The second edition, 1766, is entitled, "Die Nichtigkeit der Hexerey und Zauberkunst."

Bishop of Regensburg turned to Rome, but Pius VI, while not condemning exorcism, objected to Gassner's methods, which departed from the Roman Ritual. Gassner had to cease, but was given the parish of Bendorf, where he died as dean in 1779.—Ib., pp. 130–2.

P. Ferd. Sterzinger, in 1775, under the name of Francone dell' Amavero, printed a little book entitled "Katechismus von der Geisterlehre," of which an enlarged edition appeared in 1783 under his own name and the title "Geister- und Zauberkatechismus." In this he took occasion to attack, as far as he safely could with due respect to the Roman Ritual, the belief in diabolic possession. He pointed out that in the lands where exorcism was disused possession had disappeared, and that since the imperial Landesordnung of 1766, which provided for medical investigation of such cases, they were no longer heard of.—Ib., pp. 133–6.

In 1785 he published his most comprehensive work on the subject, entitled "Don Ferdinand Sterzinger's Bemühung den Aberglauben zu stürtzen" (München, 1785).—Ib., p. 136.

In 1786 he followed this with another work, "Die Gespenstererscheinungen," to prove the non-existence of visible ghosts.—Ib., p. 139.

He died soon afterwards, March 18, 1786.—Ib., p. 140.

II. Witchcraft and Disease.

Hoffmann, Friedrich.—*Dissertatio Physico-Medica de Diaboli Potentia in Corpora.* Halae Magdeburgicae, 1729. (First ed., 1703.)

Hoffmann (1660–1742) styles himself Consiliarius Archiatrus et Professor Regius, and his little dissertation has interest as coming from Halle, where Thomasius had introduced skepticism. He was chief physician to the King of Prussia—I suppose Friedrich Wilhelm I.

He speaks of the immense diversity of opinion on the subject—some ascribing too much to the devil and the incantations of witches, including things arising from natural causes, while others concede nothing to the power of demons, denying their operation in bodies. Against this he argues that everywhere the testimony of two or three witnesses establishes a fact, while here we have what has, in the memory of man, been believed by all races, by the most prudent theologians, philosophers and physicians, is confirmed by Scripture, by the edicts and judgments of magistrates and by the

confessions of the guilty. Disclaims all preoccupation and prejudice in discussing the subject.—Praeloquium.

Begins with the definition—"Est autem diabolus, communi omnium cum theologorum tum physicorum et medicorum consensu, spiritus creatus finitus, nocentissimus, certa potentia in creaturas, maxime in hominem, praeditus," thus begging the question in advance. He explains the attribute "finite" by the devil being subject to the increate and infinite Spirit. His will is so depraved that he is constantly struggling against God and man, which is his supreme object.—Hoffmann, §1.

Argues against those who, while they admit the existence of the devil, deny that he has power to act on material objects. It was Balthasar Bekker who revived the long discussions on this subject. If any opinion in theology and physics opens the way to innumerable errors, it is this denial. —Ib., §2—continued in §§3, 4.

It is the unanimous opinion of the wiser thinkers that the devil cannot perform miracles.—Ib., §5.

The devil cannot transport bodies through the air: this would be a miracle.—Ib., §6.

The devil cannot transmute substances—make noble metals out of ignoble or [organic living beings out of animate things]. It was God who changed the staff of Moses to a serpent and Pharaoh's magician merely produced illusions.—Ib., §7.

The devil cannot assume a real body, but can an imaginary and apparent one. Can take the shape of living or dead men or of women.—Ib., §8.

The devil cannot make men learned or wise.—Ib., §8 *bis*.

The devil cannot move solid large bodies, animate or inanimate, from place to place.—Ib., §9.

The devil cannot make a body pass through an opening smaller than itself. It is a figment that he can make the skin invulnerable to sword or bullet.—Ib., §10.

The best proof of the existence of the devil is the propensities and acts of impious men. These cannot come from God, but the devil is the author of corruption and misery.—Ib., §11.

All evil has its origin in him through his power over the human soul.—Ib., §12.

He has power over spirits (air); over bodies his power is secondary and limited.—Ib., §13.

By natural agencies he can infect the air, cause pestilence, plague of locusts, caterpillars, etc., and cause sterility. He is usually the cause of these things.—Ib., §14.

With the permission of God he can control fire.—Ib., §15.

His power over the intellect and will is spiritual, for these are spiritual. He can fascinate the senses. "Ita pleraeque operationes diaboli in sagis sunt merae illusiones phantasticae, quales sunt earum translationes ad conventicula, ecstases, apparitiones in varii generis bruta et similia." For the most part all the acts of sorcerers are nothing but demonic dreams. —Ib., §16.

But this requires a certain disposition in the human fancy. We find that those who have thick and copious blood with languid cerebral circulation are more easily thus affected. The devil knows when tempests or injuries to cattle and harvests are to occur and suggests to them to do this or that and they will follow. It thus clearly appears that the evil power of the devil over men is limited by strict laws. Incubus is merely a stasis of the blood in the lungs and brain. Melancholy hypochondriacs are most subject to these illusions: "Quare melancholia dicitur balneum diaboli." Cold climate, insufficient nourishment, exhausting labor are fruitful causes of these delusions. "Ex eo fluit ratio, cur in Italia, Gallia, inque iis locis ubi homines laborant, vinum bibunt, rationis studio indulgent, conversationibus delectantur, vel parum vel plane nihil de sagis aut spectrorum apparitionibus audiamus. Contra in septentrionalibus regionibus praefrigidis, in Lappia, Finnia, Suecia, in locis ubi cerevisiam bibunt tenuem vel nimis lupulatam, victuque utuntur duro, v. gr. ipsis [pisis?] fabis, pane crassiori, carne suilla uti in Westphalia, ducatu Meklenburgico, Pomerania, sagarum incantationum, spectrorum aliarumque daemoniacarum illusionum frequentissima occurrunt exempla; nam ingens actorum inquisitionalium copia in hisce locis obvia undique id ipsum confirmat." —Ib., §17.

This is further confirmed by the fact, alluded to by Hansen, that the beginnings of the witch-craze are to be found in mountainous regions, such as the Alpine valleys where it began. There life is hardest and the forces of nature most difficult to contend with. The same is seen in Spain, where the Pyrenean provinces were the fruitful hotbed of the craze, and in France, where the Pays de Labourd with its barren wastes and the absence of the fishermen left the women to be consumed by these fancies. Possibly also the terrible devastation of the Thirty Years' War may explain its prevalence in Germany during the seventeenth century. So Scotland was more afflicted than England, thus aiding the Calvinistic tendencies to inject into modern life the prescriptions of the Old Testament.

Cardan already had the same idea—see what I have entered from him.

There are certain stages of disease of which the devil takes advantage to instil the greatest temptations.—Hoffmann, §18.

His power over fluids and spirits enables him to inflict diseases, especially those of the spirits, insanity, melancholia, epilepsy, etc. His ability to cause impotence is known to all.—Ib., §19.

This shown by the expulsion of demons in Scripture.—Ib., §20.

Difficulty of distinguishing between natural and supernatural disease.—Ib., §21.

Differential diagnosis. Vomiting of hairs, nails, tobacco pipes, etc., is well authenticated. Retails cases, one the direct act of Satan, occurring in Jena in 1685, where a butcher's wife refused to sell to an old woman a calf's head below price, and for months passed through her ears, with great suffering, calves' brains and skull bones.—Ib., §22.

Such things are infallible signs of disease caused by incantation. Difficult to explain. Satan can only move these objects by means of witches and sorcerers, and when they are burnt the diseases cease.—Ib., §23.

The best remedies are those of Christ—fasting and prayer, conjoined with bleeding and saline purgatives.—Ib., §24.

In conclusion he says the power of the demon is less than in the time of Christ, and it is to be hoped that it will continue to diminish.—Ib., §25.

Westphal, Johan Caspar.—*Pathologia Daemoniaca.* Lipsiae, 1707.

Dr. Westphal begins with a detailed account of a case of what he calls (p. 28) "Epilepsia secundi gradus, quae vulgo Daemoniaca vocari solet" from the superstition of the pagans and Jews as to demoniacal possession.

A girl of fifteen named Anna Helena Gottschalck, of Zittau, was suddenly seized, December 7, 1705, with epileptic convulsions. In her paroxysms she repeatedly alluded to an old woman named Sabine as a witch causing her troubles. The woman had been a domestic in the house, but was there no longer. Sometimes she saw Sabine sitting in the corner of her room. January 27 Sabine came to see her and consoled her, promising relief, but the troubles continued. February 10 at 7 P.M. she told her father that Sabine was cutting wood from the enclosure of his vines and restrained him from

going out, but the next morning the enclosure was found to be cut. April 7 about noon she rose from the bed and told her father that she would find the witchcraft (*Hexerey*) which Sabine had placed, and, on his asking what it was, she described the objects and, going to a corner of the room in which she had often said she saw Sabine sitting, she brought out some and said she would find the rest that evening or the next morning. The room had been thoroughly swept out that morning. This, however, brought no relief—the convulsions and bewitchment continued, but through it all she was assiduous in singing hymns and praying, and astonished the minister who had been brought in by the piety and lucidity of her discourse. Finally on June 21, Sabine, who had been arrested, died in prison just as she was commencing to confess (probably exhausted with torture—H. C. L.). When this was announced to the patient, she exclaimed to her mother, "Be comforted, now will God have pity on me and bring relief." On June 26 she asked for her clothes and got up. After this she was not only free from paroxysms, but her muscles showed no ill effects from the six months of convulsions and contortions; there was some pain around the heart, her face was pale and her appetite slender, but these symptoms had almost disappeared when the narrator was writing, November 7, 1702 (pp. 1–28).

Westphal seems to be a rationalist. He describes anatomically how the various contortions and gyrations of what practitioners call "Epilepsia Cursiva, Saltatoria et Rotatoria" and then quotes from Bartholinus "simile fere exemplum epilepsiae ita dictae Demoniacae, seu quae diabolum mentita fuit" (pp. 28–30.

But he admits witchcraft as a contributive cause—"*Causam Occasionalem* in aegrota nostra merito assignamus fascino, statuentes *Causam proximam materialem* effluvia liquoris aquei prope fores Altmanni effusi ac in gyrum dispersi; necnon clavem quem incantatrix circa baculum suum aliquoties gyravit; et media illa Magica in quodam hypocausti angulo reperta" (p. 32).

This refers to Sabine's turning a key around a staff during her visit to the patient (p. 12). Altmann was a weaver to whom Sabine had gone on leaving the Gottschalcks and there is something (p. 3) about water having been seen sprinkled in a whirl around his doors. This latter he suggests may have been a decoction of some powerful drug and he expatiates (pp. 32–8) on the effects of hyosciamus and the aura it disseminates.

He admits his inability to explain the finding of the *fascinum* in the chamber corner and a plague of lice which was one of the features of the case, things about which even the most judicious Thomasius suspends his judgment in Programm. Lect. Hybernar., 1702 (p. 39).

As regards the method and explanation of *fascination*, it consists in the firm imagination and impression on the mind and soul of the witch, by which the effluvium of the liquor, the key and staff and other magic acts directed by her malicious intention and doubtless some adjuration, affected the girl. Emphasizes the influence of imagination and quotes Bacon (De Augmentiis, lib. iv, q.v.) that fascination is effected by it. Even the stigmata seen on the bodies of demoniacs are caused solely by imagination. Also ephialtes and incubi (pp. 40–1).

Quotes Van Helmont and Ettmüller as to the folly and superstition of referring everything we do not understand to that refuge of ignorance, the devil (p. 42).

Van Helmont (†1644), indeed, denies the ministry of the devil and ascribes the visions of the witch to the strength of her imagination and her power to bewitch to the strength of her evil desire—a sort of forecast of animal magnetism and hypnotism (p. 44).

"Van Helmont, comme son maître Paracelse, sans nier l'existence ni l'action des Démons, tend à restreindre leur action au champ spirituel."—Yve-Plessis, Bibliographie Française de la Sorcellerie (Paris, 1900), no. 1015.

Westphal proceeds to quote innumerable authorities as to the curative effects of faith and imagination, such as touching for the king's evil, exorcisms, amulets, relics, etc., and applies this to the witches' power of evil, and their ability to injure. Instances the use of powders sprinkled in roads and fields, either to injure promiscuously or only those aimed at. In 1657, two witches, Staederia and Kiepzigia, confessed to sprinkling a powder of hyoscyamus and other seeds, in the devil's name, in a field, which killed the cow of a woman they hated and left the rest of the herd unhurt. Remy tells of the similar case of Alexia Drigaea (Daemonolat., lib. ii, c. 8, n. 13). Many similar cases.—Westphal, pp. 45–9.

With all his learning Westphal had never read the Malleus, for he quotes from it at second hand through Godelmann (p. 48).

Shows how it had sunk out of sight by this time.

He explains why witches lose their power when arrested and imprisoned because they lose all faith in their magic power and are unable to injure the officers of justice. The evidence of this is universal (pp. 49–50).

Simply by the power of will and strong intention hunters and soldiers can prevent the explosion of gunpowder. It is the same with rendering bridegrooms impotent by tying knots in straps and the other modes described by Bodin. This also explains the sieve and key, the ordeal of hot iron, of cold and hot water, etc. (pp. 50–1).

Quotes the Gospels to show the curative power of faith (*e. g.*, Mark, x, 34, "Thy faith hath made thee whole"). Also Hippocrates and Avicenna as to the influence of imagination and belief. To the same power of imagination he attributes (pp. 52–4) belief in attendance on the Sabbat and intercourse with demons, though curiously enough he seems to know nothing of Cap. Episcopi. (He is a warm Lutheran with great contempt for Catholic transubstantiation and Calvinist "consubstantiation by local inclusion" and Calvinist Reformed "metaphorical body of Christ."—H. C. L.)

Goes on to explain from these principles the case of the epileptic girl, in which the will-power of Sabine and the vindictive spirit of the girl concurred (pp. 55–80).

Curious story of an old woman who in 1674 confessed to congress with an incubus, commencing while in her mother's womb and continuing through life. She had had three husbands by whom she had no children, but had had repeated conceptions by the demon. The case was referred to physicians. Dr. Michael Ettmüller in a long opinion pronounced her insane, her intercourse with demons imaginary and her progeny faecal discharges under severe constipation. The Medical Faculty of Leipzig concurred in this and she was saved from the stake (pp. 80–1, 101–7).

Tells of a case of his own in which a precocious girl of twelve had chlorotic fits of epilepsy in which she would accuse an old woman of bewitching her and would sing amatory songs. He prescribed marriage as a cure, but the next year she had an illicit affair with a military officer and the epileptic fits ceased (pp. 82–5).

All the various apparitions of demons as described in animal and human forms are mere phantasms arising from the corrupt fancies impressed on children by parents and nurses "et utinam non ab ipsis animarum pastoribus, catachetis et

paedagogis." In a word they are *deliria* partly idolatrous, partly hypochondriacal, and stolidly melancholic or maniacal (p. 86).

Attributes the rise of magic to the arts of priestcraft striving to convince the people of its supernatural power (pp. 87–90).

Admires the audacity of those who stigmatize as Atheists all who deny the devil—they rather merit the name of Adiabolists than even that of Adaemonists (p. 91).

He explains the cure of the girl of Zittau on the death of the old woman by the fact that, when the idea impressed by her expired with her, then, the cause being removed, the magic effect ceased, as the charms had been already removed (p. 99).

Eberhard Gockel relates in his *Curiosus Tractatus Polyhist. Magicus-Medicus* that, when he was physician at Giengen, he was often sick and so were his servants, and his cattle were lame without apparent cause and no cure was found till by accident a serving maid discovered under the threshold a green jar with an egg inside involved in white threads, after which the sickness ceased (p. 99). Carrichterus in his treatise *Von Zauberischen Kranckheiten* very properly advises the physician when called in to such cases to investigate the corners of the house, when, if the charm is removed, the illness ceases (p. 100).

This shows his credulous belief in spite of his philosophy.

G. A. Z.—*Historisches Send-Schreiben von denen so genannten wunderlichen Begebenheiten welche sich an etlichen Knaben zu St. Annaberg in diesem ietztlauffenden 1713 Jahre geäussert. Darinnen ein unvorgreiffliches Bedencken und Raisonnement über das vielfältige suspecte judiciren wegen vermischter Hexerey entdecket und wie dergleichen Affectus vormahls auch ohne alle praesumirliche Hexerey in Foro Medico observiret und durch Göttliche Hülffe glücklich curiret worden.* Chemnitz, 1713.

We hear much about bewitched patients whose diseases physicians cannot understand or cure. There is therefore interest in this little book, by a learned, experienced and pious physician who signs himself G. A. Z. (he was well-known, but prudently concealed his name) with the date of August 16, 1713.

St. Annaberg is a little town not far from Chemnitz (Saxony).

He commences with a very long and detailed account of the sickness of a boy of twelve (Langhammer), which began March 10. He had the strangest convulsions and contortions,

in which it required from two to four persons to hold him, scrambled up the walls and bounced up into the air from his bed. He also had frequent trances and visions. He seems to have been a pious lad and sang hymns and psalms and prayed to God for relief. In April 1 he announced that he had learned in a vision that it would cease on April 12; and so it did for a week, when, his mother chancing to tell him that people said he was bewitched, it suddenly recommenced and lasted until June (pp. 3–28).

This is a report by the father of the boy. The last date mentioned is June 5, when he was still suffering, and nothing is said as to the end.

He proceeds to discuss the case, which he says might at first sight be attributed by the inexperienced to suspected persons causing it by witchcraft. But the new doctrines deny sorcery, while Satan can do nothing out of the course of nature or produce the supernatural and can only work by natural magic and by natural means. He discusses epilepsy, hypochondriac hysteria, opisthotonic convulsions, the influence of the seasons, of innutritious and unwholesome diet and other causes; he dismisses obsession, and refers to epidemics of malignant spasms in 1596 and 1597 in the province of Cöln, Westphalia and Hesse, and in 1648, 1649 and 1675 in the circle of Plauen and Vogtland; also he briefly describes several recent cases of the same kind. He argues that Satan can take advantage of all predisposing causes and that he specially delights in these mysterious diseases and trances, in which only the restraining hand of God prevents him from proceeding to extremities. Popular credulity assigns these cases to sorcery, but this is an error, in support of which assertion he cites various recent medical authorities; and he relates in some detail additional cases occurring in children and youths (pp. 47–61).

Diabolical possession, he says, is now properly included among diseases caused by sorcery (p. 62). But in these cases there is no *corpus delicti*, such as vomiting coals, needles, hairs, toads, mice, etc., which in the forum of jurisprudence and medicine is an infallible sign of witchcraft through which an assumed witch can properly be punished. There are witches who out of mere melancholic folly imagine themselves to be such and perform witchcraft, though they have no pact with the devil, all of which is imaginary and they are innocent (pp. 63–4).

The finding of a package of all sorts of things in the chamber of a patient—and much less the utterances of a young person—is no justification for arresting a perhaps honest person and torturing and punishing her because the patient has said that she appeared to him—unless indeed the exception of the jurists as to secret crimes is applicable to our case; but I leave this to the jurists and will not interfere with their profession and appear as a patron of witches. Nor will I disturb the authorities in their office of punishment, knowing well that the hellish mischief-maker cannot always injure men without human instruments and that he supports them and with the permission of God can do great damage to men and cattle, and therefore they are properly punishable; but Professor Thomasius of Halle in his *Lehr-Sätze* recommends caution (pp. 65–6).

As to the *Responsa* and *Judicia Superiorum* on sorcery, I leave them to their functions, since for the most part they judge not so much the suspicion as the diseases caused by sorcery according to the report sent to them; but I will not always let myself be persuaded by authority, as it is well known that these Collegia often render self-contradictory sentences (p. 66).

A skilful practitioner can readily from the above cases draw useful conclusions. *Morbi insoliti et monstrosi* are more easily cured than *morbi ex fascino*. The latter, since the so-called *corpus delicti* (the *signum*) cannot always be investigated and removed, are incurable, and they leave behind them mortal injuries, while in *Opisthotonus* the patients remain vigorous in spite of the terrible convulsions and paroxysms. The medicines should be administered with prayers and reverently signed [signatured?] and given in due order, otherwise Satan will laugh at the whole cure. A pious physician should trust in God and Nature and as a higher minister use his privileged rights against the devil, avoiding carefully all absurd and superstitious things and using *antispasmodica, antidaemoniaca* and other specific remedies, which put to shame the proud hellish spirit. The patient and his family should have patience and never seek the help of the devil and his followers or take advice of empirics and ape-doctors. Concludes by extravagantly recommending Hypericum (St. John's-wort) as sovereign in melancholia and mania, spasms and convulsions, and specifically for incantations; on account of its wonderful texture the devil cannot endure it and it is

therefore named *Fuga daemonum*. It is all the more precious mystically through its blood-red tincture, which leads to a higher signature and signifies the blood of Christ in far higher power against soul-convulsions and hellish temptations. I will say and wish that the blood of Christ, as the heavenly Hypericum and most powerful *Fuga daemonum*, might heal all such suffering sick persons and cleanse them from their sins (pp. 68–72).

Thus the writer practically—though not theoretically—rejects sorcery as a cause of diseases, while admitting that sorcery diseases are incurable. But Satan has a hand in these obscure hysterical cases and the remedies are both physical and spiritual. His general position is shown in a motto on the back of the title-page, quoted from a contemporary, Dr. Wedel, "Dantur morbi a fascino, neque tamen quivis graviores ad veneficia referendi."

He does not deny witchcraft, but he evidently attaches little importance to it. He would seem to be internally incredulous, while hesitating to proclaim it.

KUNAD, ANDREAS.—*Synodal-Programma und Disputation von den Annabergischen ausserordentlichen Kranckheiten*. Annabergae, 1717. (Printed in Hauber, Bibl. Magica, III, pp. 207–39.)

Kunad was a prominent man, then Superintendent at Annaberg and soon to be General Superintendent of the County Mansfeld at Eisleben. In summoning a synod of the clergy of the diocese of Annaberg in 1717 he made this the subject of his program. He says it made the very name of Annaberg repulsive and no one could learn without sighing the miseries of the innocent town.—Bibl. Mag., III, p. 208.

He says there was similar trouble in 1710 at Crotendorf and in 1712 at Johann-Georgenstadt.—Ib., p. 209.

It commenced October 26, 1712, with the ten-year-old son of Johann Gottlieb Adami, preacher at the hospital, who was brought home sick from school, suffering apparently with a dry asthma, which developed into spasms of hands and feet, followed by contortions of the body and finally convulsions. Then the boy saw spectres—a hairy monster and a woman with wide-open mouth and black teeth gazing through the window. Then he would be violently thrown out of bed to the floor. All efforts of the physician were fruitless.—Ib., pp. 210–11.

Then on March 12, 1713, Johann Gottlieb Langhammer, twelve-year-old son of a pious man of the same name, was

seized with a similar disease.—Ib., p. 212. (This I have above.[1]—H. C. L.)

Then March 20 there was alarm about two eggs found at the door of Christian Dietel, schoolmaster of the hospital. They were regarded as witch charms and were ordered to be thrown in the brook, but the person who carried them opened them and found in one a little yolk and in the other a sticky membranaceous material; but Dietel, who had cautiously touched one of them with finger tips, for three days had severe pains in the right hand and left knee, accompanied with murderous thoughts, until, by God's grace, he was relieved by bloodletting and the use of Spiritus Bussii.—Ib., pp. 213–4.

In April three boys, from thirteen to sixteen years old, are attacked after undergoing various supernatural experiences—one of them having twice been approached by the devil with promise of money if he would sign a paper, and threats to kill him if he would not. Mysterious eggs also figure in these cases and several old women who are suspected of witchcraft—one of them the same as she who persecuted Langhammer.—Ib., pp. 214–8.

By this time the whole town was disturbed and wretched. Every day there were reports of finding in the streets or market-place or the bed-straw of the patients sorceries such as eggs, cakes, bags filled with herbs, paper, onion peels and eggshells, bread, stones, knives, etc. Men and animals who touched them were injured, and dogs and geese which ate them died.—Ib., p. 218.

As the infection spread it was not confined to boys, but attacked strong men and women, of whom twelve are named, including Eva Elizabeth Henningin, of whom we shall hear below,[2] and others who complained of molestation by spirits. —Ib., pp. 218–19.

These all asserted that they saw spirits, when their eyes were open or closed, who told them of the future course of the disease, and molested them terribly. They had sharp pains and wonderful convulsions and contortions; some would be lifted on high from their beds; some would throw themselves on their heads and then on their feet, more than four hundred times a day, with incredible swiftness. The assertion that they flew around like flies is a fable. They had abhor-

[1] See pp. 1471–2.

[2] See pp. 1476–7 and 1480–2 (under Bucher).

rence for spiritual books and were terrified when the devil was named. They struggled, as if in a trance, with the spirits, whom they imagined to urge them to pact with the devil, to kill their parents or themselves, and they felt as though stuck with needles or penknives, or pummelled with blows or burned with red-hot iron, and signs of this were sometimes seen on their bodies. One woman extracted needles from her flesh which she said the spirits had stuck there, and said a little white dove with a crucifix had visited her and prophesied the destruction of the town and other evils. When the paroxysms passed they speedily recovered strength and when they left the town or passed over water they were relieved. When brought before the authorities and questioned, or anything implying sorcery turned up, their tongues were paralyzed and they could not speak. It was reported that one had a triangular spindle by which she knew what happened to the other patients, what *the torturers* did in the prisons and what the outcome would be.—Ib., pp. 221–3.

The physicians examined varied in opinion. One said it was imagination perturbed by dread of sorcery; another, that it was a *morbum complicatum* in which there was something supernatural; the third, that it was the work of sorcery. The Leipzig medical faculty decided that, if all stated in the protocol was true, without error or deceit, there was no doubt of the supernatural.—Ib., p. 224.

There was no little belief that the affair was either the work of witches, who to serve the devil sought to do evil; or of the devil, called from hell by the treasure-seekers, who endeavored to placate him with human blood. The people said that a boy who some years before had been found dead in the upper room of a house was clamoring for revenge, and some of the patients claimed to have seen him sighing and pointing to his murderers. Catholic priests and friars from the neighboring Bohemia came with holy water and blessed candles and other sacramentals and contributed their help. The authorities sought earnestly for those suspect of sorcery and cast many into gaol.—Ib., pp. 224–5.

Tells of treatment of various cases—among them, that the celebrated physician who treated Langhammer cured him by threats and stern looks. It was discovered that certain wicked fellows ran shrieking at night through the streets, pretending to be spirits, and scattered eggshells, packages and other things to create terror. The Henningin, under serious warn-

ings, withdrew her story of the white dove and she was found to have told falsehoods, such as her wounding spirits with a dagger or knife and that when she crossed water they could not follow. A pastor of the town, Gabriel Bocarus, was of service in tracing out the deceits and Superintendent Kunad tells of his own experience in detecting popular exaggerations. The evil was always greatest when it was reported that the king, or his ministers, or other prominent persons would come; also on the yearly fairs and festivals or when foreign merchants came or there was an effort to defend the opinion of sorcery. Exaggerations were circulated, as when a man declared that a surgeon had cut out of the body of his daughter a mouse, with eyes, ears and tail, but when the surgeon was examined by the authorities he said he had drawn some pus from a swelling but had seen nothing of a mouse. One could not approve of the frequent assemblies of the sufferers in private houses, against the orders of the authorities and counsel of intelligent physicians, for the trouble was held to be infectious.—Ib., pp. 225–8.

It spread to the neighboring places, especially to Berenstein and Thuma, whose preachers wrote largely thereon to the Superintendent Kunad.—Ib., p. 229.

Of those imprisoned on suspicion of sorcery, the old woman so bitterly complained of by Polmer (and Langhammer) died of sickness. The shoemaker (Johann Christian Wolf, who possessed a book of Paracelsus which he did not understand) through prolonged and horrible imprisonment went crazy; with a long knife he severely wounded two female fellow-prisoners and cut his own throat. The rest, though they possessed some superstitious things, could not be convicted.—Ib., pp. 229–30.

The Leipzig Schöppen, after carefully weighing the evidence, ordered the prisoners to be released, with warning as to the superstitious things they had. The patients, who were evidently disturbed in fancy, were to be left to the physicians.—Ib., p. 230.

Things were quieting down when they were started anew by a physician who came from another place. He said that Anna Maria the Müllerin had a beast like a porpoise moving around in her body. By an incision he removed some little bones. Then all the other patients clamored that they had beasts in their bodies, till the authorities separated the Müllerin and the Henningin from the rest and threatened the others with

prison, when they found that they had no beasts inside.—Ib., pp. 230–1.

Kunad goes on to discuss minutely all the questions suggested by the affair. It is unnecessary to follow him throughout, but it is worth while to record that, as to the question whether the devil was concerned in it, he replies in the negative and that it was merely a spasmodic disease.—Ib., p. 233.

Many wonders were related and believed which on investigation were proved not to have occurred.—Ib., p. 234.

The authorities of the town, after long and laborious investigation, reported to the king, and so did the preachers to the Superintendent, that no sign of diabolic concurrence was found.—Ib., p. 235.

An exception was Adami, the hospital preacher, who labored to suppress the Disputation of Kunad, and procured an Ober-Consistorial order to send it to the higher Collegium and meanwhile suspend its circulation. This was done and permission was given for its circulation. Adami had contributed largely to spread the panic, and his son was one of the first boys who played a part in the comedy.—Ib., pp. 236–8.

This affair is worth giving in some detail as illustrating the atmosphere of fear in which the population lived, the exaggerations which converted natural events into Satanic wonders, the way in which the witch-craze spread and the fact that, but for the skepticism beginning to prevail among the governing class, St. Annaberg would have contributed a dozen or more victims to the stake.

Long account of a somewhat similar trouble with two children at Ilssfeld in 1696.—Hauber, III, pp. 252–63.

The case of the Langhammer boy was one of the earliest of an hysterical epidemic occurring in St. Annaberg from 1712 to 1720, which attracted much attention. The populace attributed it to witchcraft, as did many of the upper class, supported by the clergyman Johann Gottlieb Adami, preacher in the hospital outside of the city, in whose family the first case occurred; also by two physicians, J. Q. Rebentrost and Bertram Peter Cassel, and a lawyer, Jo. August Richter. Those who denied the Satanic character of the trouble were stigmatized as ignorant and evil-minded.—Hauber, Bibl. Mag., III, pp. 30–1.

The "Historisches Send-Schreiben" above mentioned is the first publication on this affair. Then comes a "Trauriges Tage-Register derjenigen Begebenheiten so sich in der freyen Berg-Stadt St. Annaberg in dem 1713 Jahr bis hieher mit

unterschiedenen Knaben und erwachsenen Weibes-Personen zugetragen, unpartheyisch-wehmüthigen Lesern communiciret," Chemnitz, 1714. The writer professes to give only a dry and impartial statement of facts. The reader, he says, would offend him terribly if he held it to be a practical possession by Satan and he would laugh at him as grossly ignorant of the symptoms of possession. Yet it would not be difficult to prove that it arose from sorcery. What his real opinion was is seen from his closely following the relation of Franciscus Simon, Pastor of St. George and Job in Hamburg, who tells that in 1504 at Spandau the devil scattered through the streets money, bread, linen, rings, knives, needles, buttons, and whoever picked them up was possessed; and Albertus Colerus, preacher in Spandau, writes that, when the demons in the possessed were asked why they thus molested the children of God, they answered that God had commanded them to do so, since the people would not listen or follow His word. Now at St. Annaberg at the beginning there were scattered in the streets and before the doors all kinds of things, especially eggs and nuts, and the sickness must have arisen from this.—Ib., pp. 33–6.

The next writing is "Sinceri Philalethae, Academ. Natur. Cur. Socii, unvorgreifliches Sentiment von dem elenden Zustand unterschiedener Kinder und erwachsenen Personen in St. Annaberg, einem Academischen guten Freunde daselbst auf Verlangen wohlmeinend communiciret," Chemnitz, 1714. He takes the ground that the devil has no part in the matter, but he recognizes in it fascination and sorcery worked by occult natural causes and that those who do it are evil and morally devilish.—Ib., p. 37.

The next writing is by the hospital preacher Joh. Gottlieb Adami, whose ten-year-old son was one of the afflicted: "Kurtze Nachricht von der seltsamen und kläglichen Begebenheit an Kindern und erwachsenen Personen zu Annaberg" (Annaberg, s.a.). He relates many wonderful occurrences which could be caused by neither human wickedness nor delusion.—Ib., p. 38.

Then comes "Opisthotonus Daemoniacus dilucidatus et defensus: d. i. Erläutertes historisches Sendschreiben von denen so genanten wunderlichen Begebenheiten an etlichen Knaben zu Annaberg, darinnen das im vergangenen 1713 Jahre zu Jatropoli (Qy. Arztburg in Franken?—H. C. L.) gründlich abgefassete, nachgehends aber übel verstandene

und scoptisch(sceptisch)-beurtheilte Bedenken," etc. (too long to copy in full—H. C. L.), Zwickau, 1715. The author of this is the well-known physician of Zwickau, Dr. Georg Andreas Zeidler, who defends and sets forth more clearly his position in his previous work (apparently he is the writer of the first "Historisches Sendschreiben"). He argues that there is no special witchcraft in the affair, but that it is a rare natural disease, yet that the devil has a direct hand in it.—Ib., pp. 39–40.

Then Dr. Christian Höpner, physician at St. Annaberg, "Acta privata betreffend diejenige Kranckheit," etc., Leipzig, 1720.—Ib., p. 40.

Finally, the "Bericht von dem Ausgang des Annabergischen Hexen-Wesens" of the celebrated Dresden physician Urban Gottfried Bucher, physician of the royal council, in his "Sachsenlands Natur-Historie," Dresden, 1723. (Printed in Hauber, III, pp. 41–66.) In this he says his object is to induce all public authorities and all physicians, when they encounter cases similar to those of St. Annaberg, not to ascribe them to the devil, but to recognize from this example how much can be accomplished by the arts of a malicious woman or of other persons.—Ib., pp. 41–2.

He formed part of a commission, appointed by electoral decree of March 27, 1720, to investigate the affair, and was intrusted with the medical part of its duties.—Ib., p. 43.

The first effort of the commission was with Eva Elisabeth Hennigin, a woman of twenty-six, who had trances and ecstasies in which she talked with spirits, in epileptic *Opisthotonos* —also needles in various parts of the body. Commencing March 30, 1720, by somewhat vigorous treatment on the part of Dr. Bucher and a surgeon, she was cured, and they reported that there were only natural causes at work and no witchcraft. —Ib., pp. 45–52.

He says the so-called *Annabergische Kranckheit* commenced with some boys who had contortions and falls; they wished for this disease, which they heard talked about, so that they might get some money. Their brother stopped this with blows, as he with their mother regarded it as imposture, as they saw no spirits. To win belief then they saw spirits, such as the so-called Bier-Pampe, Frühstückerin and the like of whom the other sick people said so much, so that at last they were regarded as really bewitched. Then she (Hennigin)

was taken to the house of correction at Waldheim (there is a sudden break from these boys to a woman), and as her troubles ceased she was allowed to return home. She remained quiet for a while, but at the end of 1719 she had visions of spirits again and complained of pains in various parts of the body, for which medicines did no benefit. There was a three-footed goat which appeared at her bed on November 30 and licked her legs, and witches who stuck needles in her, but on incisions being made no needles were found. In October, while returning home from Waldenburg, in the Frohnauer Wald, there appeared to her a person aged, of hideous appearance, who told her the death of a man of Annaberg. Long account of her sufferings: needles in her arms which returned after extraction; seeing spirits—a dark man in a shroud and a dog with fiery eyes and tongue, and other spirits around her, then a white dove which sings hymns and the spirits depart.—Ib., pp. 53–6.

She (Hennigin) was taken from St. Annaberg to Dresden and put in the Lazareth. At her departure, when passing the churchyard, she saw the spectre of a suicide who wished her ill-luck. After this all was quiet, both with her and in the town. While the commission was there, some came with complaints of molestation by spirits and that they were persecuted by the Hennigin, but this was regarded as a *pia* or *iniqua fraus* of those who through simplicity had suffered themselves to be deceived; they were turned back with sharp reproof and thus the evil which for seven years had troubled the town was removed.—Ib., p. 57.

Meanwhile in the Lazareth the Hennigin began to confess freely all her deceptions and the advantage she obtained from them. For instance, how she practised the convulsions and contortions and *Opisthotonos*, which she learned from a rope-dancer, until she could perform them readily and quickly. How with scissors she made the semicircular cuts on her arms and legs which she attributed to the finger-nails of witches. When she reported the three-legged goat licking her legs, she scratched them with a knife till they were red and very painful. When she wagged and turned her head, she said the witches did it; they had a bladder with water in it and when they shook it she had to move her body. If they blew into the mouthpiece of the bladder, her body was raised in the air. The needles, etc., found in her were stuck there by herself and taken from a vessel full of them which stood in her mis-

tress's chamber. The white, black, brown and gray powders which she said were brought by the spirit or the witches were lime or whitewash from the walls or oven-dust or chalk or ashes which she ground or chewed up and placed in her mouth. It is not worth while to detail more of the deceptions, which, as the writer says, required only cunning, watchfulness and speed to deceive the simple folk.—Ib., pp. 57–61.

Her motive was curiosity and to imitate the contortions of the boys, to excite the admiration of the simple folk and to get a living without labor from the compassionate during the seven years through which she practised it. One thing, besides the close investigations of the Commission, which contributed to her free confessions, was the hope of marriage, when she should be declared not to be bewitched, for she was lustful, as was shown by her giving birth in the Lazareth to a stillborn child; but she failed in this, for in place of a bride-bed she was confined in the House of Correction.—Ib., pp. 61–3.

After this St. Annaberg was free from the reputation of witchcraft and never again manifested such superstitions.—Ib., p. 66.

Bucher laughs at the learned consultations of the doctors over the woman, their various diagnoses and the analyses of the powders which she ejected from her mouth and in which they found arsenic and other potent drugs.—Ib., p. 63.

Corvinus, Johann Friedrich.—*Dissertatio Inauguralis Medica de Potestate Diaboli in Corpus Humanum.* Halle, 1725. (For the Doctorate in Medicine in the "Alma Regia Fridericiana," *i. e.*, University of Halle. The printer styles himself *Acad. Frider. Typogr.*)

This is a learned dissertation, in philosophical and scientific form, arguing the agency of the devil in disease.

He commences with a prayer that in this difficult field we may walk in light and truth, so that we may point out the pernicious arts of Satan, and then in the panoply of spiritual arms we may elude his plots with pious prayers (p. 7).

He asserts that the devil can affect the body directly by motion derived from his own essence, or indirectly through the soul. That angels can move bodies he holds has been demonstrated by Buddeus in Theol. Dogmat., lib. ii, c. 2, §27 (p. 9).

Satan, however, can only exercise his power by permission of God. The degree to which this conception of God's supremacy led theologians in their effort to reconcile it with the existence of evil and of evil spirits is seen in Corvinus' quotation from Spener, the founder of Pietism, "God must participate in all the sins of men; . . . no thief, murderer or adulterer could execute his sins without the participation of God, . . . but God is not guilty of the sins" (p. 15).

The devil can only work through natural powers—supernatural are reserved for the Creator alone—but he can do things impossible to men through his knowledge of natural secrets (p. 17).

Only pertinacious scepticism can deny his power over corpses, as in the case of Samuel—though that may have been an illusion produced by his infernal art (p. 17).

He denies the devil's power to generate a human body by natural propagation, as held by many who are subject to papal superstition (p. 19).

He condemns the simple credulity of those who talk about the *veneficia daemoniaca*—"man sey beschryen, behext, bezaubert" (p. 20).

The devil can appear in human forms (p. 25).

The devil can excite tempests and produce pernicious effects by air and fire, but this does not justify fatuous simplicity, stupid credulity, foul fables, etc. (p. 28).

He can so corrupt human senses as to make men believe they have seen what is not true; and by mixture of bodies, colors and figures he can represent what are Satanic illusions (p. 30).

While he does not in words allude to diabolic possession (he does subsequently, p. 38), he ascribes to the devil all the afflictions, spasms, convulsions, howls, blasphemies, prophecies and predictions of that condition, though he admits that sometimes they may proceed from natural causes (p. 34). He admits all this as possession on p. 47.

The devil can excite depraved and immoderate love (p. 36).

He quotes Bodin, Binsfeld, Remy and others as to the *somnum daemoniacum*, though we should not always ascribe to it the insensibility under torture, which may proceed from the stupefying effect of intense suffering, but it cannot be denied that it may be through the help of the devil (p. 36).

The devil exercises his power over the human body through natural means whether he does so by applying them in a

subtile mode or through his instruments "ministerio videlicet *malitiosorum* hominum" (p. 37).

"Quod id ipsum *per alios* committere queat, quod tamen *ipse fecisse* propterea judicandus est"—for which he refers to Bodin, Remy, Del Rio, Torreblanca and others (p. 38).

He suggests that there are things in nature which affect the human body in an almost miraculous manner and that the devil knows them (pp. 40–1).

The devil out of various materials can form a body like that of man and with it cause various evils to soul and body and thus he can have intercourse with lustful humans—though he can so corrupt human senses that they imagine these things—but this does not exclude the other (pp. 41–2).

It does not do to reject indiscriminately the cases of ejecting coals, fragments of glass, of mineral, metals, of pottery and vases, bunches of straw, feathers, hair, pieces of hide, nails, pins and ascribe them to fraud or imagination, for the devil can convey them into the body in minute particles and then coalesce them (pp. 42–3).

The devil can exercise this malice by himself or he can give to his servants and instruments the knowledge of these natural things producing evil results in man and the method of applying them and he can coöperate in their application. The truth of sorcery (*veneficium*) committed by men is repugnant neither to reason nor to observation, if only again, in this disquisition, preconceived opinions are avoided (p. 43).

Why cannot the devil so teach his pernicious lore that such men taught by the devil—"sive *praestigiatores*, sive *nigromantae*, sive *sagae*, *lamiae*, *lemures*, *veneficae*, etc., dicantur" —may execute his depraved and infernal arts? Therefore we by no means reject the doctrine of incantations promiscuously, but still less adopt it indiscriminately, since fables are mixed up with true facts and many old women's opinions and superstitions with solid reasons (pp. 43–4).

Explains in his pseudo-scientific way how the devil can so corrupt the senses as to produce the evil eye and its effects (p. 46).

As the devil brings disease, so he can remove it, but it is not licit to have recourse to him. When the physician's resources fail, recourse must be had to prayer (p. 49).

This is a curious exemplification of the application of rationalism to confirm superstition. It indicates that it was felt that the old beliefs could not be defended in the old way. In the age of Newton and Locke and Leib-

nitz the development of science required witchcraft to be proved scientifically and Corvinus makes the attempt, though the system he advances is based wholly on unsupported assumptions and is as unscientific as possible. The principal importance of his dissertation is in showing how hard the old superstitions died, for there is not one of them that he does not accept and endeavor to explain. If the Academia Fridericiana was the University of Halle of Chr. Thomasius, the work is notable. (It was what became the University of Halle—see Grässe, p. 124.)

There must have been an active persecution in Tyrol, c. 1740, for Tartarotti says, "Non mancano esempi anche a, presente in più luoghi, spezialmente della Germania; ma noil senza andargli a cercare altrove, abbiamo fresca la memoria della deplorabil carneficina, che se n'è fatta in queste nostre parti, ove altre lasciarono la testa sotto la spada del carnefice, altre nelle carceri miseramente perirono."—Tartarotti, Del Congresso Notturno, Introd., p. xxix.

D. SURVIVALS INTO LATER TIMES.

I. Teachings of Modern Churchmen, Catholic and Protestant.

Winzer, Julius Friedrich.—*De Daemonologia in Sacris Novi Testamenti Libris.* Vitebergae, 1812, 1813; Lipsiae, 1821, 1822.

This consists of five addresses made in the above years, all required to carry out the plan promised in the first one. The little work has its importance, as in the first part Winzer was professor of theology in the University of Wittenberg, and in the later ones he is its Rector. It thus shows the orthodox attitude in the early nineteenth century. It has importance, moreover, from its collection of texts showing how ever present to the minds of the founders of Christianity was the idea of Satan and how large a part he played in their teachings.

The first address comprises cap. 1, "De geniorum malorum existentia." It cites all the passages in the New Testament in which the devil and his angels are alluded to under various names and epithets. That the author is a man of extensive learning is shown by his footnotes, largely exceeding the text in amount, which cite authorities of every kind.

The second address (1813) contains cap. 2, "De geniorum malorum natura et viribus." He commences by discussing the meaning of πνευμα and argues that spirits have bodies, notwithstanding Christ's saying, Luke, xxiv, 39, "for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have"; and St. Paul's

(Ephesians, vi, 12), "for we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against . . . the rulers of the darkness of this world." These passages, he says, do not deny that spirits may have material bodies, but more subtile than those of men. Therefore he denies that there is basis for the opinion of those who assert that the spirits described in the New Testament are "expertes omnis materiae."—Ib., c. 2, §20.

Against this he sets the angel of the Lord who descended from heaven and rolled away the stone from the sepulchre (Matt., xxviii, 2) and the face of Stephen which was "as it had been the face of an angel" (Acts, vi, 15) when brought before the Council. Also the corporal punishments denounced against demons here and hereafter (of which more below) and the Old Testament Apocrypha, where they are said to inhabit desolate cities (Baruch, iv, 35), and in Tobit (iii, 8, vi, 14, viii, 3) are represented as killing men, loving women and forced by horrid stenches to fly to distant places. Besides, the Christian doctors up to the times of the Middle Ages all give them a most subtile body, ethereal or fiery.—Ib., §21.

Then as to their powers, which the New Testament shows to be great and various. There is the knowledge and sagacity shown by Satan in the Temptation of Christ. The Synoptic Gospels indicate that demons are furnished with the knowledge of many things—that Christ was the Son of God and that he had power to harm them, and they entreat him not to torture them before the time.—Ib., §22.

In his third "Commentatio" (1821) he says the occasion had offered to complete his task and he resumes it where he left off. When Christ (John, viii, 44) calls Satan the father of lies, it shows that he has a knowledge of truth and falsehood; and so St. John (I Ep., iii, 8, and v, 18) shows that he has a mind; and Rev., xii, 12, that he knows his time is short, and xii, 9, that he deceives the whole world; and xii, 10, that he accuses Christians before God, all of which shows that he possesses both mind and thought.—Ib., c. 2, §23.

So James (ii, 19; iii, 15) shows that they know the unity of God, they look with horror to the Day of Judgment and their wisdom is evil to men. Paul, Peter and Jude assent to this implicitly, if not explicitly. Thus they are gifted with mind, reason and knowledge.—Ib., §24.

That Satan has the power of understanding and judging and applying means is seen in II Tim., ii, 26, where the snare of the devil for capturing men is described.—Ib., §25.

The constant effort of Satan and demons to injure and mislead men is set forth in Luke, xxii, 31; II Corinth., ii, 11; I Peter, v, 8; Rev., xii, 12.—Ib., §26.

Satan's hatred of truth and love of error are seen in John, viii, 44; Rev., ii, 24; I Timothy, iv, i.—Ib., §27.

His love of sin and vice is shown in Ephesians, ii, 2; I John, iii, 8; John, viii, 44.—Ib., §28.

His hypocrisy and deceit in II Corinth., xi, 14.—Ib., §29.

His pride and love of glory in Matt., iv, 8–10; Luke, iv, 5–7; I Tim., iii, 6.—Ib., §30.

In the fourth "Commentatio" (1822) Winzer assumes that the evil angels were created virtuous by God, but as to what was the first sin with which they contaminated themselves, if it cannot be defined certainly, at least it seems that it can probably. II Peter, ii, 4, speaks of the angels that sinned and Jude, 6, of the "the angels that kept not their first estate but left their own habitation." Now it is known that the post-exilian Hebrews believed that God assigned angels as guardians to the various regions and peoples of the earth as their habitations. This is shown in the Book of Enoch—that 200 angels or watchers came down from heaven to the daughters of men and lived with them until the deluge and begot giants on them. To the same effect is the Gospel of the Infancy (vi, 11–12—where Satan lies with a woman) and what Eisenmenger has collected, Vol. II, c. 8, p. 429. He argues that the reading of Gen., vi, 2, as Angels of God is preferable to the Sons of God. Also refers to the demon in love with Sara in Tobit, iii, 8; vi, 14. There is nothing else in the New Testament as to the fall of the angels, for the passage in Rev., xii, 7, about a battle is perverted and full of hatred and envy and places Satan with his comrades without declaring their first sin. Those who assume pride and arrogance and resistance to God, relying on I Tim., iii, 6, have a weak argument and are misled by the doctrine of Zoroaster.—Ib., c. 2, §31.

The power of action of demons is great but limited. It is partly described in the texts concerning angels, for their corruption does not impair their strength, but principally in those concerning Satan and his followers, such as I Peter, v, 8; Rev., xii, 3, 4, 7, 17, xiii, 2, 4, xx, 2; Ephesians, vi, 12; II Thessalonians, ii, 9; II Timothy, ii, 26. But these powers are limited; they could do nothing against Christ, nor can they against the children of God (I John, v, 18). Rev., xii, 7, 11, shows that they were overcome by the good angels.—Ib., §32.

The mind cannot conceive, nor does Scripture teach, that spirits formerly righteous could by a single sin have soul and will depraved and corrupted, and nowhere do we read that they gradually fell and with increasing wickedness became evil. But everywhere it is assumed that they are most wicked, enemies of God, Christ and man, impeding the designs of God, disturbing the kingdom of the Messiah and injuring the human race.—Ib., c. 3, §33.

So Christ says (John, viii, 44), "He was a murderer from the beginning" (§34).

To which we may add the text regarded as spurious, I John, iii, 8—"for the devil sinneth from the beginning." Winzer does not draw the deduction, but these texts indicate the nebulous views current as to the evil spirits, for they seem rather to derive from the Mazdean faith of original opposing forces, while elsewhere the Revelation describes the battle with Michael.

And so II Peter, ii, 4—"For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell and delivered them unto chains of darkness to be reserved unto judgment."

In the fifth "Commentatio" we are told that Satan allured the parents of the human race to error and sin, leading to the crimes and sin of mankind. He is destitute of love of truth and righteousness and delights in lies and all perversity.—Ib., c. 3, §35.

The writers of the New Testament represent all except Christians to be his subjects, whence he is called Prince of the World (John, xiv, 30; xii, 31; xvi, 11), God of this world (II Cor., iv, 4), and they are caught in his snares (II Tim., ii, 26). He is prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience (Eph., ii, 2). Converts turn "from the power of Satan unto God" (Acts, xxvi, 18).—Ib., §36.

Those who depart from the faith, "giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils" (I Tim., iv, 1). Men are divided into children of God and children of the devil" (I John, iii, 10). Cain was "of that wicked one" (I John, iii, 12). Yet Christ had said (Mark, vii, 21 sq.) "For from within, out of the heart of men, proceed evil thoughts, adulteries, fornications, murders," and James (i, 14) "Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed." But Paul assumes (I Cor., vii, 5) that temptations come from Satan, and so does Peter when rebuking Ananias (Acts, v, 3).—Ib., §37.

It was the devil who put it into Judas' heart to betray Christ (John, xiii, 27; Luke, xxii, 3). In the parable of the sower it

is Satan who cometh and taketh away the word sown in the hearts by the sower (Mark, iv, 15; Matt., xiii, 19; Luke, viii, 12). So it is Satan who seeks to entice away Peter (Luke, xxii, 31). It is Satan who hinders Paul from visiting the Thessalonians (I Thess., ii, 18). Peter warns against the devil as a roaring lion seeking whom he may devour (I Pet., v, 8). In the future, after a thousand years, Satan is to be loosed from his prison and deceive the nations and encompass the camp of the saints, till God sends fire from heaven and destroys them, when the devil is cast into the lake of fire to be tormented forever and ever (Rev., xx, 7–10).—Ib., §39.

GÖRRES, JOHANN JOSEPH VON.—*La Mystique divine, naturel et diabolique.* Traduit par M. Charles Sainte-Foi, 2. ed., Paris, 1862.

Görres (January 25, 1776–January 29, 1848) was an "um die Erneuerung des katholischen Deutschlands hoch verdienter Mann." By turns a natural scientist, publicist, historian and theologian, he influenced largely the character of the Catholic revival in Germany with his unwearied pen, which was guided rather by an ill-regulated imagination than by sober judgment. Cf. Wetzer u. Welte, vol. V, p. 794 (Freiburg i. B., 1888).

His great work is his "Mystik," which appeared in four volumes, 1836–42, of which the first two volumes were devoted to the divine mysticism, in which he sought to explain in terms of scientific order and classification all the supernatural manifestations claimed by ecstatics of all ages. The last two volumes treated of diabolic mysticism, thus recognizing the identity of the two classes of phenomena, which, he held, drew their powers the one from a divine, the other from an infernal source.

I have not access to the original and my references must be to the second edition of the French version. The first [French] edition apparently appeared in 1854 (see La Mystique, vol. V, p. 548). Of the five volumes of this edition diabolic mysticism occupies the last three. It commences by saying that we have followed the mysticism which ascends to God until it attains the Holy of Holies; we must now return to the point of departure and trace its descent to the abyss until it plunges into the darkness of radical evil.

That so thoroughly loose a thinker, who takes for granted all his premises without an effort to test their validity, should have possessed the influence which he undoubtedly exercised over the public affairs as well as the thought of the time, shows how easily men can be misguided by eloquent verbosity and robust assurance. His insatiable credulity accepts whatever suits the purpose of the moment and draws from it whatever conclusions may be desired.

Thus Görres traces the origin of magic to the old Hebrew legend that after the deluge Ham[1] discovered the buried runes

[1] A somewhat similar story is told of Kâinâm, grandson of Shem.—Book of Jubilees, p. 66.

which Cain had inscribed on stone and the infernal powers labored for its development and propagation. The worship of Baal was the witches' Sabbat of that period, held publicly and in the open, and the Baal cult was not restricted to Syria and Chaldea, but was the same as the religion of Egypt and the worship of Siva in India, as the Dionysiac Mysteries of Greece and the Bacchanalian orgies of Rome, and even the Asa-faith of the Northmen.—La Mystique, liv. v, c. 1 (vol. III, pp. 12–14).

Christ, after conquering Satan, precipitated him to the bottom of the abyss and rolled over him the rock on which he built his Church. There the apostate angel twists himself in the convulsions of impotent fury and sometimes, shaking the weight under which he groans, he produces the violent shocks which agitate the spiritual world. But it is all in vain, for he has lost his former formidable power.—Ib., p. 17.

If so, why has he been ever since so active, with the permission of God? Too hasty!

Still neither man nor demon has lost the free-will he had before redemption; Christ only broke the bonds which tied the former to the latter, so that the demon can now only rule us with our own consent. If God permits him sometimes to visit us and make us feel his power, it is for our own good and he can never injure us against our consent.—Ibidem.

Redemption has only made the conflict more bitter in rendering it more spiritual; but at least the arms are equal on both sides and, if we will, our victory is certain.—Ibidem.

It illustrates the manner in which his superficial knowledge leads him to generalize from false premises that he says the Manicheans and Cathari worshipped the Evil Principle and thus spread throughout Europe the cult of Satan.—Ib., c. 2 (p. 34).

The absurdity of this is seen in the fact that to the Cathari the Jehovah of the Christian was the Evil Principle who created and ruled the material world, while their effort was to escape to the Good Principle who created and ruled the spiritual universe—which explains their thirst for martyrdom.

He assumes as facts all the horrors related of the midnight assemblages of the Euchitae, the Cathari, the Templars and the Fraticelli.—Ib., pp. 43–6.

Not to be outdone, the translator, Charles Sainte-Foi, adds a note ascribing the same hideous observances and devil worship to modern Spiritualists—"hommes d'une condition élevée

pour la plupart, éclairés dans le sens que l'on donne aujourdhui à ce mot, savants même, exempts par conséquent des préjugés qu'enfante l'ignorance."—Ib., p. 47.

It was only left for Leo Taxil to ascribe the same to the Masons.[1]

In treating the Cap. Episcopi he introduces a positive assertion that "Il ne faut pas oublier non plus que certaines femmes abominables servent de succubes aux démons"—of which there is no trace in the original.—Ib., c. 3 (p. 49).

The world of gnomes and elfs and sylphs, black and white, is to him an existent reality, in proof of which he recounts, as a recent fact (borrowed, however, from a book published in 1730—H. C. L.), a story of a German gentleman conducted by a monk into the cavern of the Sibyls, where he encounters all kinds of marvels. This is followed by an account of another exploration, near Innsbruck, of the subterranean land of the dwarfs, who come to the surface at night to help those to whom they are friendly and injure those whom they dislike.—Ib., c. 4 (pp. 85–7).

There is nothing too gross for his capacious credulity and he never stops to verify his facts.

Then there is another exploration of the kingdom of the dead, inhabiting caverns in Carniola.—Ib., pp. 88–90.

This may presumably be taken as the basis of his theory: "If the spirit of man succeeds in establishing relations with the higher powers, he acquires greater force and energy and can exercise greater empire over nature. Now he can enter into relations with the heavenly powers or with those of the abyss and demand from them this increased energy. In the former case he performs wonders for a good cause, in the latter for an evil. In both he exercises a real power over nature and in some sort fashions it at will."—Ib., c. 6 (p. 117).

Then he proceeds with a long succession of the legendary careers of magicians—Simon Magus, Heliodorus, Virgil, Merlin, Zyto, Faust, etc., and winds up with the moral that these wonders could not have suggested themselves to the popular imagination without a basis of fact. "Thus every legend, whatever liberty its author may have taken in its embellishment, rests on a truth and indicates it, and the legends inspired by the same subject bear witness, by their agreement, to a general truth—a fundamental truth, born as it were with

[1] See Mr. Lea's article, "An Anti-Masonic Mystification," in *Lippincott's Magazine*, vol. 66, pp. 948–60 (Dec., 1900).

humanity and developed with it throughout history."—Ib., p. 142.

Then follows a long and comical account of the Mosaic creation of six days reduced to scientific terms—an unintelligible medley of the interaction of the four elements, earth, fire, air and water, under centripetal and centrifugal and chemical and mechanical forces, all calculated to impress the vulgar with the scientific attainments of the writer.—Ib., c. 7 (pp. 143–72).

He talks (p. 151) of vertebrated animals as forming a kingdom distinct from birds and fishes, as though the latter had no vertebrae.

The whole chapter is a curious [case] of self-complacent ignorance concealing itself under a torrent of words, the ultimate object being to prove the mysterious relation of man to spiritual powers, manifested especially in certain individuals who can control the occult forces of nature.

Influence of the sun and especially of the moon—they not only give life but they preserve it, and still more they destroy it when the time has come, or when in anger they cut the thread before the appointed time. Thence arises the necessity of gaining their favor or conciliating them if irritated and for this recourse must be had to those in relation with them, as to the priests of Apollo and Lucina. These gifts were more common in antiquity than now, but always the need of them has been felt. Therefore it has been necessary to train men for it by ascetic exercises and thus there has been formed a school of inspired seers.—Ib., c. 8 (pp. 187–9).

All this would be reproduced in our days, if Christianity had not abolished star worship, for certain exceptional natures are still in relation with them, as was seen in the female rhabdomant of Constance (1818) and in the Seeress of Prevorst.—Ib., pp. 195–7.

There are others who have secret and mystic relations with the earth—for which he instances the Spanish Zahoris.—Ib., c. 9 (p. 199).

This he learnedly explains by an internal light of the eye, more penetrating than that of the sun.—Ib., p. 201.

Then there are others who possess a mysterious sense of touch, which resides principally in the soles of the feet and causes peculiar sensations when walking over hidden springs or beds of minerals. Cites the cases of Pennet, Papponi, and Catherine Beutler.—Ib., pp. 201–3.

Others are affected by the touch of different substances. With the Seeress of Prevorst a piece of rock crystal placed on

her hand would in time produce catalepsy.—Ib., c. 10 (pp. 204–8).

Rhabdomancy—case of Aimar.—Ib., c. 11, pp. 209–26.

Relations between men and special substances which establish connection "between the internal fire of life and the fire of nature, the vital breath in the arteries and the breath of the atmosphere, the water of life in the blood and the exterior water, finally the terrestrial element existing in the bony and muscular systems and the earth on which we walk. . . . Such is the magic of the elements, associated with that of the stars, producing effects and establishing relations no less remarkable than those resulting from the commerce of man with the sidereal world."—Ib., pp. 227–35.

Mystic relations of man with the vegetable kingdom—effect of drugs, etc.—Ib., c. 12 (pp. 236–56).

Magic relations of man with the animal kingdom. On one side he can exercise magic power over certain species, on the other he may become in a certain way their slave. Serpents, tarantulas, loups-garoux explained with the same pseudo-scientific solemnity as the others.—Ib., c. 13 (pp. 257–81).

Magic relations between men. Those of the dead with the living—vampires. Gives full credence to awful stories of vampirism. About 1720 in Servia a man who had been dead for thirty years killed by sucking their blood his own brother, one of his sons and a servant. Another dead for sixteen years killed his two sons. Their bodies when exhumed were undecomposed and were burnt. All those killed by vampires become vampires, so also do those who eat the flesh of animals killed by vampires. It is no wonder that in 1732, at the village of Meduegga, on exhuming 13 corpses, 10 were found to be vampires and only 3 natural. Not only he relates all this and much more, seriously, but follows it with a detailed anatomical exposition of the processes by which the vampire's corpse remains alive, thus giving it a scientific appearance.—Ib., c. 14 (pp. 281–94).

The nightmare is a white phantom, a silent shade or a form of an animal which strangles with horrible suffering by pressing the neck and stomach. All its action seems directed to the solar ganglions and the surrounding nerves—parts peculiarly accessible to magic influences.—Ib., p. 294.

Of course he has full faith in the evil eye, not only in killing those looked upon, but he tells of one man whose looks bored holes through glass and of another who thus set fire to barns.

Scientific explanation of the evil powers of the human eye.—Ib., c. 15 (pp. 296–304).

Nightmare produces a certain relation between the sexes, thus affecting the nervous system which is the seat of this relation. The Romans called it incubus and succubus, the Greeks Ephialtes, the Gauls Dusii and the ancient Germans Alpes or Elfs. He explains this scientifically as being usually a disease of the imagination.—Ib., c. 16 (pp. 305–10).

Under the head of the magnetism which forms a magic bond between the operator and the subject he treats of hypnotism, in which the latter is absorbed, so to speak, in the former. When carried, however, to a supreme degree with certain persons the positions are reversed and the magnetiser becomes subject to the magnetised. We have found this power in a great number of ecstatic saints and we shall meet with it in the diabolic phenomena (p. 311). Explains spectres and apparitions by the assertion that we have two bodies, both the image of the soul which resides in them. Ordinarily they are united and are separated by death, but there is an intermediate state in which they can be temporarily disjoined and then reunited (pp. 317–18). (But he neglects to explain how the clothing, in which apparitions are seen, is likewise doubled—for apparitions do not appear naked.—H. C. L.) Even the material body can be transported (pp. 321–5).—Ib., c. 17 (pp. 310–26).

Proceeds with the same subject. The strange farrago of assumptions by which he pretends to prove his assertions is illustrated by a couple of passages—"The earth has above it the sun and the sidereal world, below it the moon and the inferior world" (p. 326). "The head is provided for the spirit, the torso for the soul and the vascular system for the life. The soul is thus the bond between soul and life" (p. 328). Long and confused anatomical details to give a quasi-scientific aspect to his crude speculations.—Ib., c. 18 (pp. 326–40).

Physical basis of diabolic mysticism—second sight—attendant brownies. Lights which announce deaths—distant vision.—Ib., c. 19 (pp. 341–62).

Attendant household spirits, who can traverse matter and render themselves invisible. They assist in house-work. The Greeks called them καβάλλοι, in the North they are called Kobolds, in Sweden Trulles, in France Gobelins or Lutins, in Spain Trazgos, in Italy Farfarelli, in Russia Coltren (p. 363). Sometimes they are mischievous and cause disturbances,

throwing stones, etc. (p. 366). Case occurring in 1818 at Münchhof in a house inhabited by H. J. Aschauer, professor of physics and mathematics, and reported by him in much detail to Görres, where windows were broken and much damage done (pp. 368–78).—Ib., c. 20 (pp. 363–80).

The Drummer of Tedworth.—Ib., c. 21 (pp. 381–95).

Spirit-rappers. That of Wesley (John Wesley's father) in 1716. One at Hudemühlen from 1584 to 1588, which talked freely. Similar one at Drepano in 1585. Familiar spirit of Raimond, Count of Corasse, related by Froissart. Case at Malta early in eighteenth century, where the spirits were visible. Other cases.—Ib., c. 22 (pp. 396–413).

Malicious spirits—the demon of Camnuz who burnt houses and crops (which I have from Sigibert—H. C. L.), that of Schildach in 1533 (which I have from Erasmus—H. C. L.). Another less destructive at Constance, in 1746. The spirits of Woodstock in 1649. Other cases of the spirits of the dead. —Ib., c. 23 (pp. 414–38).

All these apparitions are the work of the demon. Cases to prove it, from sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.—Ib., c. 24 (pp. 443–455).

How God permits demons to tempt and persecute saints, to exercise and purify them. Cases. This contains a typical specimen of the pseudo-science with which he dignifies his crude assertions: "L'homme, avons-nous dit, a un côté diurne ou lumineux qui s'exprime dans le corps par toute cette moitié tournée vers le dehors, laquelle comprend les systèmes nerveux, depuis le cerveau et la partie antérieure de la moelle épinière jusqu'à cette portion du système ganglionnaire qui se rattache à celle-ci; et un autre côté nocturne ou ténébreux qui comprend la partie postérieure de ce même système ganglionnaire de la moelle épinière jusqu'au cervelet" (p. 456); though what this has to do with the temptation of St. Anthony and others is not plainly perceptible.—Ib., c. 25 (pp. 456–72).

Cases of Christina of Stumbele (1247) and Domenico de Jesu-Maria.—Ib., c. 26 (pp. 473–89).

Cases of the Carmelite Franc, S. Pedro de Alcantara, Sebastian del Campo, S. Francesca Romana, S. Crescentia of Kauffbeuern. Modern case of Maria of Moerl.—Ib., c. 27 (pp. 489–99).

Reactions of saints on spirits.—Ib., c. 28 (pp. 500–28).

"Satan is the originator of evil; he did not find it, he did not receive it from another, he invented and produced it.

He wished to imitate God and create like Him, and evil is his chef-d'oeuvre. The author of evil, therefore, is a spirit, and, like all spiritual beings, one and personal. But, as there is much evil and many wicked things, he is the chief of these scattered multitudes and it is in this quality that he is called Satan. The evil which he originally drew from himself has something of the sin of magic, while the evil which he communicates to men by a kind of contagion resembles voluntary and guilty possession. . . . It is with Satan that those who become his slaves contract, by the sin of magic, relations of the second kind; and the sin of magic only continues the first fall of the rebel angels and places man, as respects Satan, in the same relations as those held from the beginning by the demons who compose his kingdom. In fact man, by magic, makes himself, like the rebel angels, the subject of the devil, his assistant, his instrument in the production of evil, each one within the limits of his personality.—Ib., liv. vi, c. 1 (vol. IV, pp. 5–6).

Why do we hear in all this nothing as to the permission of God?

What we have seen in divine mysticism reproduces itself in the infernal mysticism. In one as in the other the phenomena develop themselves in the same order and by the same steps, with the difference that the one is the opposite of the other.—Ib., p. 10.

Scientific explanation of witches' ointment, with examples of illusions.—Ib., c. 5 (pp. 69–85).

Applied to Eve's apple (pp. 88–9).

All this is the sacrament of the devil, which replaces that of the altar (p. 93).

Divination—its wonders accepted. Explained by clairvoyance.—Ib., c. 8 (pp. 112–31).

Invocation of spirits—"Why should they be deaf to conjurations, to the prayers of magic, to the charms of its mysterious words or even to its threats? As soon as we suppose that spirits cannot resist these things, theurgy arises as of itself and developes into all its forms." (A fair specimen of his *ad captandum* method.—H. C. L.) "To understand how far antiquity pushed this art, it suffices to read the writings of Proclus, of Porphyry and especially that of Iamblichus on the mysteries."—Ib., c. 9 (p. 133).

Thus he accepts all the wonders of the Neo-Platonists.

Relates at full length the description in Lucan of the "horrible" evocation by Erichtho of the spirit of a dead man, as though it were all fact, and says that we find these [evil ceremonies] still in Christianity, though more rare and less abominable.—Ib., p. 136.

Though the attempts to invoke Satan often fail, this negative proof is nothing in the face of the facts which establish positively the possibility and the existence of a formal pact between man and demon.—Ib., p. 138.

Satan is not obliged to obey and God may not permit him.—Ib., p. 139.

Most of the formulas of invocation are evidently human inventions, but among them are some which may well have been furnished by demons and preserved by tradition.—Ib., p. 140.

We meet familiar spirits in all ages. Mostly their relations with men reveal neither evil nor good intentions—only a kind of game or amusement, indifferent in itself.—Ib., p. 142.

Simulated possession—cases.—Ib., c. 11 (pp. 165–77).

Simulated sanctity—cases.—Ib., c. 12 (pp. 178–97).

Lust disguised as sanctity—cases, including La Cadière.—Ib., c. 13 (pp. 198–215).

Why more frequent with women than with men (pp. 222–3). Deceits of the devil—money changes to dung, etc. (p. 224).—Ib., c. 14 (pp. 216–26).

Even as baptism binds a man to God, so pact binds him to the devil—but the Church can break it and release him from his slavery (p. 227). Cases showing in detail the various forms of initiation (including that of Theophilus of Adana) all related as veritable facts—drawn from Caesarius, the Malleus and other similar sources (pp. 227–48). When one has not courage to break the pact, the devil comes in time to claim his prey. Case of Abraham Pollier, in 1684, carried off by the devil and his body found with the neck twisted (pp. 249–51).—Ib., c. 15 (pp. 226–34); c. 16 (pp. 234–51).

Pact separates a man from the City of God and he becomes a citizen of the City of the Devil. He surrenders his will to the devil; he wishes what the devil wishes and permits the devil to exercise his will in him and do what he pleases. His spirit is united to the spirit of the devil (p. 253). It is thus that the City of the Devil is maintained from day to day (p. 254).—Ib., c. 17 (pp. 252–60).

In magic, man submits himself voluntarily to the infernal powers. In possession, the initiative comes from these powers, either through relations which sin establishes between them or by divine permission (p. 260).—Ib., liv. vii, c. 1 (vol. IV, pp. 260–5).

Case of a count of the Valtelline in 1654 whose house for two years was rendered uninhabitable by demons casting stones about. So with the Protestant pastor Schupart (in the county of Hohenlohe), who for eight years, by day and night, had pointed knives thrown at him and his wife, or lassos thrown around their heads or feet, or the house would burst into flames. During this he was struck by many thousand stones, weighing 10 or 15 pounds, thrown with great force.—Ib., c. 2 (pp. 266–9).

Date not given—from a book printed in 1779.

Further cases of similar nature in convents—especially those reformed after a period of laxity. He has a glimmer of sense that in these there may be traces of deception, but stoutly asserts that the devil is at the bottom of it.—Ib., c. 3 (pp. 270–8).

Further stories to illustrate the passage of obsession to possession. Of one simply impossible he says there are things difficult to believe, but that is no reason for rejecting it (p. 283). Case of daughter of Giovanni de Buon-Romanis, obsession almost amounting to possession (pp. 284–94).—Ib., c. 4 (pp. 279–94).

Unintelligible explanation of the nature of possession.—Ib., c. 5 (pp. 295–301).

Causes and dispositions that may bring possession.—Ib., c. 6 (pp. 301–5).

Case of Leuwarda of Nabburg who was playing with glass rings when her impatient husband gave her to the devil and she was at once possessed (p. 305). Cases in which despair or wrath have allowed the demon to take possession. Cases of brides refusing access to husbands—a miscellaneous lot.—Ib., c. 7 (pp. 305–14).

Cases caused by hunger and thirst, ill-treatment, sickness, phases of the moon.—Ib., c. 8 (pp. 315–23).

Spiritual influences may cause it—or a simple look or a jest. The demon appears in the shape of a man or of an animal or bird—an owl, a bat, a black dog, a goat or a wolf. Sometimes the devil when painted on a wall will appear personally (p. 332).—Ib., c. 9 (pp. 324–35).

Quotes Job that no power on earth is comparable to that of Satan. If it depended on him alone he would make heaven his chair and the earth his footstool; on earth he would accumulate torments and punishments and make it a hell, but, thanks to God, his power has not this extension and intensity of action (p. 346). Missionaries are unanimous that in pagan countries of both the old and new worlds the planting of the cross and the sacrifice of the mass weaken notably the power of the demon (p. 337). But before the demon can possess a man he must do something that opens entrance—or his parents or husband. Power thus of imprecations.—Ib., c. 10 (pp. 335–41).

Sin as a cause of possession.—Ib., c. 11 (pp. 342–53).

Duration of possession—may last a life-time.—Ib., c. 12 (pp. 353–78).

One man may be possessed by a number of demons, or one demon may possess several persons. This is determined by Providence, which regulates all details (pp. 378–9). Extraordinary stories.—Ib., c. 13 (pp. 378–86).

It may be remarked that no recent or contemporary cases are given—all are old, and many taken from the Acta Sanctorum.

Possession by the spirits of the dead—though there may be deceit in these cases, as the possessing demons tell lies.—Ib., c. 14 (pp. 386–91).

As the dead must be either in hell, purgatory or heaven, how can they torment the living?

Symptoms of possession.—Ib., c. 15 (pp. 391–5); c. 16 (pp. 396–99).

Possession in the organs of movement.—Ib., c. 17 (pp. 400–10).

Changes produced in the motor system.—Ib., c. 18 (pp. 411–30).

Diabolic flight (transportation) common to ecstatics and demoniacs.—Ib., c. 19 (pp. 430–39).

Effects of possession on the lower regions and organs of nutrition.—Ib., c. 20 (pp. 439–49).

Effects on the pulmonary system.—Ib., c. 21 (pp. 450–4).

Effects on the circulatory system—stigmatisation. This in ecstatics is the result of greater plasticity in the circulatory system, which thus becomes, through the imagination, accessible to impressions of a high order. These conditions can also exist in demoniacs, though the impressions are of a low order.—Ib., c. 22 (pp. 454–66).

Possession in the superior nervous system.—Ib., c. 23 (pp. 467–72).

Influence on speech—understanding and speaking strange languages.—Ib., c. 24 (pp. 472–89).

Influence on the senses—forms in which the demon appears.—Ib., c. 25 (pp. 490–509).

Influence on the spiritual faculties.—Ib., c. 26 (pp. 510–16).

Deliverance of demoniacs. The purpose of God in possession is to punish and amend the sinner, so that the demon acquires a sort of right in the possessed thus surrendered to him. The exterior rite of the Church to expel demons, therefore, will not suffice if its action is not preceded by a sincere renouncement of sin, without which the separation of man and demon is incomplete (p. 518).

Possession is a diabolic disease with its roots in the organs of the human body, and in this respect, like all bodily diseases, it has its causes, its predispositions, its course, its periods, its intermittent or continuous symptoms and its termination in death or cure (p. 519).

A demoniac nun was brought to St. Marie d'Oignies, who cured her after a long struggle. When the demon left her he appeared to St. Marie and admitted that he had to do what she commanded. She consulted her friends—one advised her to send him to the desert, another to hell; she chose the latter and he descended thither with frightful howling and she perceived among the infernal spirits a great movement as though one of their chiefs had rejoined them (pp. 325–6).—Ib., c. 27 (pp. 517–31).

Polemics of the possessed—case of Nicole d'Aubry (Florimond de Rémond, Histoire de l'Hérésie, II, xii). Case in Poland in 1627. Luther's failure in exorcism.—Ib., c. 28 (pp. 532–41).

Powers of Church to expel demons.—Ib., c. 29 (pp. 542–51).

Power of priests to exorcise—sacraments and sacramentals, faith, confession, the Eucharist, relics, the cross.—Ib., c. 30 (pp. 531–64).

Precautions to be taken in exorcizing. Past ages attributed too great a part to the demon in human affairs—modern times have passed to the other extreme. (This is a curious remark, seeing that practically he is at least equal to the most advanced demonologists.—H. C. L.) Even priests refuse to recognize possession (pp. 565–8). Care required to verify the fact of possession and then to detect the deceits of the

demon (pp. 568–9). Especially the accusations he may make, which have caused deplorable results (p. 572). Carnal temptations to which the exorcist is exposed (p. 574).—Ib., c. 31 (pp. 565–80).

Natural cure of possession.—Ib., c. 32 (pp. 580–6).

Crises of possession during cure—through ejections and vomiting. Substances ejected—charcoal, reptiles, etc.—Ib., c. 33 (pp. 587–98).

Spiritual crises in possession.—Ib., c. 34 (pp. 599–610).

Possession sometimes passes into union with the demon. This may be the result of a voluntary pact, or the demoniac may become exhausted with the long struggle and cease to resist. His sufferings at once cease and he becomes the voluntary instrument of the infernal powers and consequently responsible for the evils wrought by them through him (pp. 1–2).—Ib., liv. viii, c. 1 (vol. V, pp. 1–6).

He attributes the origin of diabolic magic to the Cathari, who commenced to show themselves in Europe in the eleventh century. While outwardly they were strict ascetics, there was an inner sect who worshipped the devil and used the magic arts which they had brought from the East. They celebrated their impure rites in caves and mountains and forests. To prove this he quotes stories from Caesarius and Thomas of Cantimpré in the thirteenth century of the false miracles wrought by them.—Ib., c. 2 (pp. 6–19).

More stories from Caesarius, Brognoli and Psellus to show the intimate connection between heresy, possession and magic.—Ib., c. 3 (pp. 19–30).

Influence of Judaism, the Talmud and Cabala on magic. Judaic demons. The murder rite treated as a fact. Jewish magicians.—Ib., c. 4 (pp. 41–60).

The Gypsies—their magic and divination.—Ib., c. 5 (pp. 60–6).

Influence of individual temperaments. "Ces dispositions naturelles et maladives sont développées encore bien souvent par des influences sidérales!" (p. 68)—especially the sun and moon. Myths of the South—Diana and Dame Habonde—changes to Hecate and Lamia. Myths of the North—"Holda, cette Diane des peuples septentrionaux" (pp. 70–1). Remnants of paganism among the peasants, especially in mountainous and remote regions, assist in preserving the cult of the demon.—Ib., c. 6 (pp. 67–78).

Spread of magic (witchcraft) along the mountains from the Alps into Spain.—Ib., c. 7 (pp. 79–93).

Long account of the persecution for some years by the devil of successive members of a family at Köge near Copenhagen. A woman named Johanna Thomania was accused of causing it; she was tried and executed September 11, 1612 (pp. 94–103). Similar case in 1836 of three brothers, peasants, in the Duchy of Baden. They were Protestants, but despairing of help applied to a Catholic priest to exorcise the demon. He did what his limited faculties permitted with little result, which he possibly thought might be caused by their being outside of the Church (pp. 104–110). Allusion to the virtues of the juices of certain plants out of which unguent is made to transport to the Sabbat (pp. 110–12).—Ib., c. 8 (pp. 93–112).

Familiar spirits, Kobolds, Follets, etc., attaching themselves to persons and tempting or molesting them—sometimes playing polter-geist—leading to pact. Cases.—Ib., c. 9 (pp. 112–19).

Ecstatic prophets in the Cevennes excite the Protestants to revolt in 1685 and 1702. (What has this to do with magic? —H. C. L.)—Ib., c. 10 (pp. 120–4).

Case of Magdalena de la Cruz, under guidance of demon.—Ib., c. 11 (pp. 124–34).

"He who, by any of the means above described, is bound to the Evil Principle, finds himself in a new sphere. He undergoes a kind of metempsychosis and his whole being participates in the new relations which he has contracted, for the principle to which he is subjected seizes him in all the regions of his being, or penetrates gradually, involving them further day by day in its accursed bonds; it appropriates his whole nature and modifies it according to its own laws." (A specimen of his generalizations evolved out of his internal consciousness.—H. C. L.) In support of this he gives a very long and detailed case of a nun in 1584 who, at the age of four, had been given over to the demon by a malediction of her father. The demons had made her sign and then swallow five several pacts—all of which were recovered when she was released by the intervention of St. Magdalen and the ministration of the Archbishop of Cambray. All this, he says, is incontestable.—Ib., c. 12 (pp. 135–55).

As food sustains natural life, so magic unguents and potions serve to provoke in man the phenomena of magic. These

are ordinarily prepared from the juices of plants of which the sap is thick and milky and from those which are narcotics. "Now the inferior region of the human body reposes on the vegetable element in man and this element again reposes on the exterior vegetable kingdom, which nourishes and sustains it. . . . The distinctive characteristic of the vegetable kingdom is sleep—not the motionless and continuous sleep of the mineral kingdom, but a kind of half-sleep which does not impede the interior circulation of the sap but renders impossible the exterior movements seen in the animal kingdom. Thus all the narcotic substances as yet known are furnished by the vegetable kingdom. . . . Every plant acts specifically upon the organ which is in relation with it. Thus, as there are cardiacs, aphrodisiacs, etc., so there are magnetic substances acting on the ganglions and producing the dispositions necessary for the development of magnetic phenomena (pp. 155–6). . . . Evil spirits take advantage of this, when man deliberately has recourse to their methods; he thus gives access to the demon, and natural means then become magical and guilty." One who is naturally disposed to clairvoyance has no need of them, while in others their use long continued will at length render them unnecessary. De Lancre says that in the Pays de Labourd it was generally believed that the unguent of sorcerers was made of the fat of unbaptized infants; that it was customary for novices to receive it from those more advanced who prepared it themselves. This was a means of obliging them to kill children. When the initiated had made some progress the ointment became useless. Goes on to quote De Lancre's account of their frequenting the Sabbat while in prison and deprived of unguent, all of which he assures is true. While Görres talks of clairvoyance he assures us that the transportation is not an effect of illusion, but is veritable (pp. 159–60). At the same time, on the authority of De Lancre, he tells us that when witches wanted only to go to the Sabbat in imagination they lay down on the left side; then when they awoke the demon caused them to exhale a thick vapor in which as in a mirror they saw all that went on in the Sabbat (p. 161). Proceeds to explain philosophically the different kinds of sleep.—Ib., c. 13 (pp. 155–64).

Every one has a right to mark his property, and every one on entering this region receives a mark by which he is recognized. It may be hidden, but cannot be effaced without the help of a higher power. It consists of little elevations, the

size of a pea, on the surface of the body, which are insensible. They are often red or black spots or depressions. Sometimes there is no exterior indication and they can only be discovered by those who know the places where they ordinarily occur, or by those who have an instinct for these things. When a needle is thrust in there is no pain or bleeding. They are readily distinguished from those caused by disease—for which he gives the diagnosis. Quotes Remi, De Lancre, Del Rio and Gauffridi's case (pp. 165–66). "Il y a là comme une sorte d'éruption où le mal intérieur se révèle" (p. 168).—Ib., c. 14 (pp. 165–8).

Diabolic increase of desire for food. "Il se fait dans l'homme admis à ces horribles festins comme une sorte de trans-substantiation, qui change pour ainsi dire sa nature en celle du principe auquel il a soumis sa vie et qui lui en communique à la fois l'esprit, les sentiments et les pensées." In these banquets there is no salt and instead of bread there are cakes made of peas. Salt prevents corruption, it is the symbol of the conservating principle, and there is no wonder that it is not found on the tables of him who is principle of destruction and death. Yet the meats at these banquets are only appearances and after them the participants are hungrier than before. Or the demon gives only putrefying meat. Putrefied human flesh is one of the dishes most in favor, especially the flesh of those who have been hanged or assassinated. Still more in demand is that of unbaptized children, or, in lack of this, of baptized children. He accepts, without reconciling them, the discordant stories of the torture chamber and revels in the orgies described at Logroño (pp. 169–71). Yet, after reciting all this as fact, he qualifies it. It is probable, he says, that more than once men or women, given over to the demon, have exhumed and devoured the corpses of infants. But ordinarily this sort of thing is only in vision. . . . "Tous ces festins sont donc des visions, et les mets qu'on y sert sont des aliments intérieurs et spirituels. Ce qui en forme la substance, c'est le péché; quant à la forme sensible sous laquelle ils se produisent, ce n'est qu'un symbole trompeur et mensonger. Mais quiconque mange des mets fournis par Satan et boit de son calice sent le besoin de respirer aussi dans son atmosphère" (pp. 171–2).

All this *galimatias* shows that he does not himself exactly know how far it is safe to believe and he conceals his indecision in a cloud of verbiage.

He cannot accept the absolute union of human beings and demons—"les orgies, de même que les festins du Sabbat, n'ont de réalité que dans l'esprit qui les conçoit." To reach this conclusion he distinguishes between the spirit (or instinct) of reproduction and the organs which serve it and conceives a condition of ecstasy in which the phenomena are neither altogether real nor purely imaginary "Cent, deux cents personnes, plus ou moins, de tout âge, de tout sexe, magnétisées, pour ainsi dire, par le démon, entrent ensemble et à la fois dans une sorte de somnambulisme infernal" in which they believe that they satisfy their passions (pp. 173–4). He speaks of the "union mystique de l'âme avec le démon; et les fruits de cette union c'est toute la série de ces crimes épouvantables dont les procès intentés aux sorciers font mention. Le people, s'emparant de ces idées et de ces faits, leur a donné sa forme; et de là viennent ces récits populaires sur les orgies du sabbat." (These are not mere popular stories—they are as well attested in the trials as the *crimes épouvantables* which he accepts as facts.—H. C. L.) These stories are true when traced back to their true source, for the facts related are real, not with the vulgar reality which we have daily under our eyes, but with the higher reality of the spiritual regions (p. 175). (It is a hard nut for him to crack; but his customary vague generalisations enable him to juggle with the intelligence of sympathetic readers.—H. C. L.) Then he proceeds to quote from De Lancre and Remy as though their stories were facts—then treats of procreation and changelings—also of the Elbes or "entozoa" which were the result of commerce with the demon, about which he sagely remarks, "Ces sortes de phénomènes s'expliquent par les principes que nous avons posés plus haut" and that the sur-excitation of the sexual organs may cause inflammation and the formation of abnormal products (pp. 176–9).—Ib., c. 15 (pp. 169–79).

It is impossible that lives passed in this spiritual deformity should not affect the exterior and this is shown in the hideous ugliness of the sorceresses. It also causes them to exhale a stench from the mouth, the whole body, which is communicated to their garments and fills their houses and the vicinity and infects those who approach (pp. 180–1). We can attribute this to the secretion of a malodorous animal oil, within the organism, arising from the impure ardors which consume them (p. 181). This explains why the saints often distinguish

by the smell the sins of those who approach them—especially sins of the flesh (p. 182).—Ib., c. 16 (pp. 180–82).

He explains the flight of witches by certain causes (not described) which change the centre of gravity of the body and render flight possible (p. 183). Quotes various cases from Remy, Binsfeld, etc., and then in a rambling and inconclusive discourse leaves us in doubt whether he considers it a reality or a somnambulistic illusion.—Ib., c. 17 (pp. 183–95).

The chapter devoted to the Sabbat is a strange jumble. He describes it as a fact from the relations of the trials, but does not let one see whether he regards it as a reality or a vision.

Thus, after enumerating the forms assumed by demons, he profoundly remarks (pp. 207–8): "Ces formes sont de vrais fantômes, fruits de l'union de ces femmes avec le démon. Celui-ci féconde leur sens intérieur et la nature féminine, impressionable comme elle est, développe ce germe impur." (Which he who chooses may understand.—H. C. L.)—Ib., c. 18 (pp. 196–208).

The next chapter describes as a reality the demon on his throne and the adoration paid to him, all in solemn detail. Then he enlarges on the despotism of the kingdom of the demon. The classification of the disciples, who sit at three tables according to their rank in the kingdom of Lucifer. Then the dances, which are the reverse of ordinary ones. Accounts of the Sabbat told as veritable facts. Its delights and the overmastering passion for it among the initiated.—Ib., c. 19 (pp. 209–16).

"Thus far we have considered Satan as host and king; we have now to consider him as a god adored by those who surrender themselves to him and as recruiting his church from among them. . . . The church of the demon, when once it is formed by the free choice of its members, maintains itself and grows, like the Church of God, by new recruits, and these are furnished, first by the children born in this accursed society, and then by those whom the initiated succeed in capturing and whom they bring to the feet of their God to be consecrated there by a sort of baptism, consisting in certain rites and formulas revealed in the trials." This is followed by an account of the ceremonies of initiation of children compiled from the Logroño accounts, De Lancre and Gauffridi, including the witch-mark. "Ceci fait, la nature de l'homme se trouve complètement changée et, pour nous

servir des expressions du *Compendium maleficarum*, les femmes deviennent trompeuses, traitresses, loquaces, tenaces, ardentes et luxurieuses, légères, querelleuses et rebelles, dangereuses et malfaisantes; elles ressemblent aux ours, au scorpion, au lion, au dragon, et sont un piége pour les autres." —Ib., c. 20 (pp. 217–21).

Observe in all this there is no reference to visions or illusions—all is told as absolute fact.

The next chapter describes the travesties of the Eucharist and mass performed in the Sabbat. In this he grows imaginative and poetic. "Mais dans cet horrible festin du démon le vin qu'il donne à ses adeptes est un vin enivrant, qui croît dans un sol volcanique et dans la cendre des volcans éteints. C'est là le breuvage que la femme de l'Apocalypse présent au peuple dans un coupe où boivent les princes, et qui enivre les peuples. Au lieu du miel et du lait dont se nourrissaient les premiers hommes, les enfants du démon se nourrissent du lait vénéneux que fournissent les euphorbes, et de ce miel que les Romains trouvèrent au Caucase et qui les rendait furieux. De même aussi leur pain n'est point fait avec un froment pur et sain, mais avec ces épis que la rouille a frappés et qui renferment un germe de mort" (p. 222).

Again, "Ce que l'imagination la plus déréglée peut imaginer en fait de voluptés, les choses mêmes devant lesquelles la nature semble reculer d'horreur, tout cela fait partie du culte par lequel Satan est honoré des siens. Les danses les plus lascives sont pour eux des danses religieuses. . . . Leurs amours ressemblent à ceux du tigre et du léopard; il est mêlé de férocité, et c'est dans le sang seulement que peuvent s'éteindre ses flammes" (p. 223). Goes on to describe the mass of the Sabbat as enacted in Sweden and in the Pays de Labourd.—Ib., c. 21 (pp. 221–7).

No hint that anything in this is illusory.

But he says this is drawn from the confessions of persons of low condition who may be subject to prejudices and illusions that weaken their evidence. He thereupon proceeds to confirm it by giving *in extenso* the account by one of more reliable character—Madeleine Bavent, the principal character in the tragedy of the demoniacs of Louviers (pp. 227–34). Next he takes up the description of the liturgy and ritual of the Sabbat by Marie de Sains, about whom he enig-

matically remarks, "Il importe peu de savoir si dans ces déclarations les spéculations raffinées de l'état de veille se sont empreintes dans les visions produites par la clairvoyance satanique, ou bien si, au contraire, celles-ci ne se sont pas reflétées dans les souvenirs de l'état de veille" (p. 234) (which may mean anything, but which serves to exculpate him from blind credulity if reproached with it—H. C. L.).—Ib., c. 22 (pp. 227–37).

Mystagogues of hell—a curious mixture of Illuminism, impeccability and diabolism based on the nuns of Louviers and Goffredy—all of whose monstrous stories he relates as facts.—Ib., c. 23 (pp. 237–44).

On the use of sacraments in sorcery. Quotes from the "Historia de tribus energumenis in partibus Belgii" (Paris, 1625) how the priest Goffredy made a mixture of consecrated hosts with blood consecrated in the Sabbat, brains of infants reduced to powder, blood, hair, nail-parings and other impurities, over which he pronounced the words of consecration. Three times he held counsel with the demons over this; it was sent to Satan, who communicated to it the power of producing possession. The assembly at the Sabbat offered to him in thanks a great number of children, and Goffredy as the inventor was named prince and chief of the kingdoms of sorcery. Görres, after telling this, says that he cannot guarantee the exactness of details in this, but will examine what truth there is in them. For this, after relating the wonderful powers, physical and spiritual, of the Sacrament, he says that these powers can be turned from their true purpose and applied to criminal ends, as in sorcery. Quotes the demoniacs of Louviers to prove this (and this is all the examination he gives, which is virtually to confirm the story—H. C. L.).—Ib., c. 24 (pp. 244–52).

Satan has the power to charm like that of the eye of the serpent, ordinarily resulting in a condition of obsession which forms a kind of union between those submitted to its influence. This is shown in the demoniacs of Louviers, whose experiences he relates at full length.—Ib., c. 25 (pp. 253–67).

Philosophical explanation of obsession (unintelligible—H. C. L.). Epidemic obsession—more common in nunneries. Case of the nuns of Auxonne in 1662. (This shows that what he calls obsession is the ordinary demoniacal possession—what distinction he draws is inappreciable—unless it be that here he says there was no suspicion of sorcery.—H. C. L.)

"Le mal doit avoir pris sa source dans l'intérieure du couvent, ou dans toutes les religieuses à la fois, ou dans quelques-unes seulement d'abord qui l'auront ensuite communiqué aux autres, par une sorte de contagion épidémique." . . . "Les obsessions de cette sorte en effet ne se distinguent en rien de la possession, si ce n'est par le Sabbat; et, à part le but et l'intention, elles présentent tous les symptômes que l'on retrouve dans les extases des saints" (p. 277). The occurrences at Auxonne had previously happened at Louviers (p. 279). Dancing mania in 1374 was possession.—Ib., c. 26 (pp. 268–86).

The contagion of obsession shows that there must be a kind of miasma which spreads it. Whoever sets foot in the regions subjected to the empire of the demon undergoes a transformation of his whole being which modifies profoundly all its parts. The fluids, the solids, the nerves and the parts enveloping them all feel the effects of this change, including the *aura* which surrounds each individual. Thus obsession is communicated in the same way as heat or electricity. Those who are in the power of the demon become like a ferment from which their phenomena are developed in others by means of the *aura* (p. 286). He finds evidence of this in the witches of Labourd and the Swedish epidemic at Elfdal, showing a singular confounding of obsession and witchcraft (pp. 287–88).

Then there is a disease called *layra* in southern France, described by De Lancre, in which the person affected barks convulsively like a dog or shrieks at the sight of the sorceress who has caused it—or even when she approaches without being seen—showing that she transmits it through the air (pp. 289–91).

Then follows a detailed account of the case of Maria Renata of Unterzell, drawn from a report made to Maria Theresa by the Abbot of Oberzell, Oswald Loschert. It appears from this that Renata was unpopular in the convent on account of her holding herself apart from the sisters and her asperity and she would have been advanced to prioress but for being discontented and insubordinate. Görres tells us that "on ne peut s'empêcher de louer l'impartialité et l'humanité avec lesquelles les juges avait procédé à l'enquête." It seems that in spite of her execution the possession among the nuns continued and only yielded to exorcisms employed for a long while (pp. 292–302).—Ib., c. 27 (pp. 286–302).

It seems that the distinction is that in obsession there must be an intermediary between the sufferer and the demon, while

in possession the demon seizes the victim directly and ordinarily the trouble is not communicated to others. Yet sometimes the evil seizes a number of persons at one time and the relations between them and with the demon give it a contagious character, and thus it has a great affinity with the epidemic obsession above described. Goes on to tell of the epidemic in Quesnoy le Comte in 1491 and quotes some cases from Weyer.—Ib., c. 28 (pp. 303–10).

Case of *la mère Jeanne* in the later possessions of Loudun, who was possessed by four demons—Balaam, Behemoth, Isacaron and Leviathan (p. 311). Explains that "le siège de cette vie dont le démon s'empare dans la possession est le système ganglionnaire, formant dans ses ramifications certains points centraux, et particulièrement le centre inférieur placé dans l'abdomen" (p. 312). It is an illustration of Görres' good faith that as an example of this kind of obsession he gives in great detail, as a fact told by Bekker, the marvels performed by a young man of Franeker who had a familiar spirit whom he called Serug (pp. 313–16).

The fact being that Bekker, who was called in in 1663 to treat the youth, relates it as a "farce" or "comedy" of imposition practiced by the boy, who was feeble-minded and epileptic and who finally admitted that the whole was a deception. It went on for six years, after which the youth abandoned the game, though he still continued eccentric and subject to seizures. Bekker explains how he performed the tricks which seemed diabolic (Le Monde enchanté, liv. iv, c. 9, vol. IV, pp. 152–85).

Case of Maria Mörl, of Kaldern, of which Görres had the details from eye-witnesses. Her troubles commenced July 25, 1832, and lasted until September, 1833, when she was cured by being prayed for in church, during which time she passed quantities of pins, needles, spiral wires, pieces of glass, horsehairs and nails—mostly by the mouth, but also from all parts of the body; in September, 1832, she passed through the skin of a leg a nail more than 3 inches long, but these things did not hurt her and caused no wounds (pp. 318–23). The seat of her trouble was probably in the tissues of the epigastric region, because she had a mania of gnawing and biting (p. 319).—Ib., c. 29 (pp. 310–23).

Case of Gertrude Fischer of Lubus, possessed by a demon. If she took hold of anyone by his clothes or his beard, she drew out a piece of silver, which she usually swallowed unless prevented—many persons had coins thus procured. A Protestant preacher wrote to Luther about it, who asked if the

money was good, and, on being assured that it was, advised her being taken to church and prayed for. A Catholic priest exorcised her, but she laughed at him. Luther's advice was followed and in time she was cured and enjoyed perfect health (pp. 323–4).—Ib., c. 30 (pp. 323–6).

He explains the confessions of witches who allowed their demons, in the shape of insects or animals, to suck their blood, by pointing out that demons, although immortal, are by nature impoverished and seek what they need in man. "Le froid de la mort se réchauffe à la chaleur de la vie. Or la vie est dans le sang. C'est donc en suçant le sang de l'homme que les démons se nourissent de sa vie" (p. 327).—Ib., c. 31 (pp. 326–37).

He speaks of intercourse with incubi and succubi as a disease—an hysteric somnambulism. These phenomena are not always demoniacal, but they can readily become so by consent of the will (p. 341) and he proceeds to relate numerous cases in which union with spirits is treated as an accomplished fact.—Ib., c. 32 (pp. 338–58).

Various cases establishing the reality both of love-philtres and ligatures—"on ne peut accuser une époque toute entière d'être assez crédule et superstitieuse pour employer tout son esprit à inventer et à perfectionner tant de méthodes différentes si elles n'avaient jamais produit aucun résultat."—Ib., c. 33 (pp. 359–66).

These above disorders are produced by Asmodeus, while Behemoth creates lust of blood. Case of Mme. de Brinvilliers, of Maréchal de Retz. Stories from Nider and the Malleus of midwives destroying infants. Cases from Remy. Case of Marie de Sains, a nun of Lille, regarded as a saint, who accused herself of destroying in all possible ways unnumbered infants. Görres admits that as a cloistered nun it was impossible for her to commit these crimes, but she was guilty of them in the sight of God because her will consented to them. In place of regarding her as hysterically insane, he pronounces her insane through diabolic ecstasy.—Ib., c. 34 (pp. 367–77).

The *loups-garoux* seem to puzzle him. Quotes several cases as facts. Then as to that of Grenier he says, "Grenier courait réellement; ce point est incontestable. Il a véritablement attaqué, sous la forme d'un loup, les enfants qu'il avait désignés, comme le prouvent les déclarations de ces enfants eux-mêmes, et plus encore celles de leurs parents accourus à leur secours. Il s'agit donc d'expliquer ce fait incontestable

en soi"—when he proceeds to suggest that Grenier disguised himself in a wolf-skin (which he possessed) and ran on all fours. More puzzling was the case of a woman *loup-garou* who on promise of pardon rubbed herself with ointment and fell into a trance. On awaking she said she had run as a wolf and had torn a sheep and a cow at a certain place and on sending there it was found that the damage she described had actually occurred. Then he tells of a *loup-garou* who was evidently insane and was discharged. But he says the most striking and horrible example was that of Peter Stumpf (from Delrio), executed at Bidburg (Trier) towards the end of the sixteenth century, who had lived for fifteen years with a succubus who gave him a belt on wearing which he became a wolf. He had slain fifteen children and had tried to eat his two daughters-in-law—and there Görres drops the subject (pp. 378–90).

He pursues the subject in the transformation of women into cats. Their confessions to that effect may be true, but it is impossible to admit the reality of the transformation and we must suppose that the women, having a nature analogous to that of a cat, have, under the influence of the demon, considered themselves to be cats and thus have committed "en voyant et agissant à distance" the crimes which they confessed (p. 390). The metamorphosis is wholly in the imagination (p. 391).—Ib., c. 35 (pp. 378–94).

Explains the ability to cause sickness or death by a touch, by a kind of diabolic contagion (pp. 394–402).

As to figurines, "les images employées dans ces circonstances font l'office d'un miroir, que concentre comme en un foyer l'intention criminelle des magiciens et des sorcières, et la dirige vers ceux qu'ils veulent atteindre" (p. 403).—Ib., c. 36 (pp. 394–403).

His brief chapter on tempests is occupied chiefly with the case of James VI and Dr. Fian. There is nothing about the innumerable descriptions of methods in the confessions and he evades expressing his belief as to their truth or falsity. —Ib., c. 37 (pp. 404–8).

A queer medley to explain historically how sorcery came to be justiciable by the Inquisition.—Ib., c. 38 (pp. 408–14).

"Les événements du Sabbat n'étaient-ils pas peut-être les délires de ce sommeil extatique? Et les dommages que causaient les sorcières n'étaient-ils point dus à l'action contagieuse

de l'atmosphère qui les entourait? (p. 416). . . . La fantasmagorie merveilleuse que trahissait tous les phénomènes magiques annonçait une imagination surexcitée. . . . On s'était trop accoutumé à confondre sans examen avec le démon cet espiègle que chaque homme port en soi, et à attribuer au premier sans distinction tout ce que l'on trouvait de singulier, d'original et de baroque" (pp. 416–17).

"La faute est d'autant plus légère que la maladie a une plus grande part au mal (p. 417). . . . Tous les crimes que l'on commettait au Sabbat supposaient d'abord un état analogue au sommeil et dans lequel se produisait la vision du Sabbat. . . . L'homme pourrait-il alors être responsible de ce qu'il fait?" (p. 418). . . . What constitutes the crime of magic is that the magicians give themselves to the devil, as instruments by which he can penetrate into a region otherwise closed to him. The demon is thus the chief criminal, but human justice cannot seize him, but only the criminals of the second degree who have consented to be his tools . . . Man can give himself to the demon with entire deliberation; such cases are rare, and they deserve the full vigor of the law. But the devil can cheat man by deceit, can persecute him, can take possession of him, buy him as a slave or receive him as a heritage from parents without conscience. All these differences cause degrees of guilt of which an impartial judge should take account. But how to distinguish them? It is for the Church to judge, but when external evil has been committed it is the province of the State. When poisons have been used there is no difficulty, but otherwise when the means are moral and metaphysical. In such case, if the accused confesses freely, decision is easy; but if he denies, the secular magistrate finds himself in a region to which he is a stranger. . . . If, in public opinion, crimes of magic exceed all measure, judges ought not easily to believe all reports and all accusations; but, if they find it justified by facts, they ought to recognize in the evil an epidemic or endemic character and attribute the development less to perversity than to some general influences. They have a double duty, to restrict the focus of the evil and to preserve those not yet subject to it. Here the aid of theologians is required (pp. 419–21). . . . There was necessarily much exaggeration in the accounts of magic; and among these crimes, these murders of infants of which sorcerers and sorceresses were accused,

there were many based on falsehood and illusion (p. 424). . . . To carry evil to its extreme limit, as is done by those initiated in the mysteries of magic, requires a genius of perversity, even as a genius of good is required for a mystic saint, and genius of all kinds is the endowment of but few (p. 425). . . . Union, whether with God or with the demon, is of two kinds—either with the speculative will or with the practical. . . . The operations of the practical will, manifesting themselves externally, are cognizable by the secular tribunals, while those confined within the personality are withdrawn from human justice and exclusively belong to the Church, which judges them in the tribunal of penitence. The secular tribunals have nothing to do with the abominations of the Sabbat nor with incubi and succubi; these belong to the Church alone, which must decide in each case whether the facts can be explained by the evil inherent in man or whether there must be a formal pact with the principle of evil (p. 426). . . . The facts and experience of so many ages enable us to solve these difficult questions much more readily than those living when the evil was new and consequently little known. The world then seemed threatened with all the demons of the abyss; it seemed as though a volcano had suddenly burst in the middle of society, ready to swallow it entirely, and to prevent this calamity it seemed as though the tribunals could not be too unsparing. . . . The evil was so widespread that it not only covered great regions, but propagated itself from generation to generation by a fearful heredity, so that more than once the whole population of a village emigrated solely because the magistrates would not act with severity against these crimes (p. 427).—Ib., c. 39 (pp. 408–28).

Praises the extreme caution and circumspection of the secular judges of that time. The ecclesiastical courts had a more difficult task, for they had to go to the bottom of things, but there is no reason to think that they acted with less circumspection (p. 430).

Did he ever read Tanner or Spee or Laymann? Yet he quotes Spee at much length in c. 45, pp. 506–11, and states further on (p. 513): "Or la procédure suivie pour ces sortes de crimes était telle que l'accusé n'échappait jamais."

The judges forgot that their only witnesses, who were necessarily accomplices, were also devoted to the demon, who could not tell the truth, as this was contrary to his nature; for they

contract with the demon a pact whereby he has possession of their will, and when they speak he speaks through their mouths, so that the surest plan is to absolve those whom he accuses and condemn those whom he declares innocent. Torture does not prevent this, for it does not overcome the will that dominates them. As Tanner says, it is only the truly repentant whose evidence in the presence of death deserves confidence (p. 431).

Better evidence was had from those bewitched, whose sufferings increased in presence of those who caused them. To prove this he gives a long account of the Salem witch-craze (pp. 432–8).

The witch-mark may be produced by the demon, but it is uncertain, as it may be the effect of imagination or disease. Tearlessness is also not an infallible sign (pp. 438, 439). Water ordeal (p. 440), balance (p. 441). Somnambulism often releases bodies from the law of gravity, and those who reach a certain degree of good or evil, who transcend the limits of nature and enter the kingdom of light or of darkness, may also sometimes be freed from the laws which govern the corporeal world (p. 442). (Evidently he bears in mind the levitation of saints.—H. C. L.) Torture—quotes St. Augustin against it and says if his words had been regarded many atrocities would have been spared (pp. 442–4).—Ib., c. 40 (pp. 429–44).

As an example of a well conducted trial he gives an account from Chapeaville of the case of Jean de Vaux, a monk of Stablo, who repented and accused some 500 accomplices seen at the Sabbat. He persevered in his confession through torture and was beheaded and buried in consecrated ground. He had the insensible witch-mark.—Ib., c. 41 (pp. 444–50).

Then in the next chapter he points out that, while the judges properly acted on Jean de Vaux's confession as regards himself, they disregarded his accusations. These were visions, believed by himself to be true, but of no weight against the denials of the accused when confronted with him. He was a clairvoyant and the visions seen in trances, even by saints, are subjected by the Church to the most searching scrutiny. The soul, released from the bonds of the flesh, enters into relation with God or with Satan (pp. 451–4). Then, as an example of the fatal effects of relying on such evidence, he describes the case of the Vaudois of Arras, which he excuses in view of the circumstances of the period (pp. 455–66).—Ib., c. 42 (pp. 444–66).

The *Malleus Maleficarum* is "Irréprochable dans l'intention, il manque quelquefois de discernement, et penche souvent à cause de celà vers une sévérité excessive" (p. 466).

It is impossible to determine with any certainty what Görres really believed. After talking of Jean de Vaux's experiences in the Sabbat as visions, he accepts the Malleus with only a slight drawback of occasional lack of discernment. It is so throughout. He relates the most incredible stories as facts and piles them on from every source for his hearers to believe as verities with only an occasional remark slipped in as to Satanic somnambulism.

Chap. 43 (pp. 466–86) is a rather incoherent mixture of history of the Reformation and of the recrudescence of witchcraft in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Gauffredi, Louviers, etc.

The next chapter is on the "diables de Loudun" and Urbain Grandier. He gives seven pages (489–96) to the evidence of the possession of the Ursuline nuns, containing the most incredible things (apparently from Boudon's Vie de Père Surin—H. C. L.), but says nothing of Richelieu's hostility. He says (p. 497) that perhaps no Catholic tribunal now-a-days would render such a judgment under such circumstances, but no contemporary deemed it unjust. The *lieutenant civil*, Louis Chauvet, had at first taken Grandier's part; one of the demoniacs accused him of magic, and fear deprived him of reason. The miserable end of Pères Lactance and Tranquille was owing to demoniac possession. Tranquille's demon did not leave him until after extreme unction; and then took possession of a cleric who was present (pp. 498–99). Père Surin, who only came to Loudun four months after Grandier's execution, was for twelve years possessed by a demon and in one of the attacks he threw himself from a window and broke a leg (pp. 499–502). All of which, Görres remarks, proves the danger to which exorcists are exposed.—Ib., c. 44 (pp. 486–502).

Sorcery in England—30,000 victims[1] (pp. 503–4). Spread in Germany owing to the Thirty Years' War. The people, impoverished and desperate "avait perdu toute foi dans la Providence. Il eut donc recours aux puissances infernales; et tous les arts ténébreux de l'enfer, avec les crimes et les forfaits de tout genre, marchaient à la suite des armées. La pratique de la magie était devenue générale et la vie de

[1] A wild guess, long since abandoned. Mr. Ewen, a later and better guesser, thinks the number "may be guessed at less than 1000."

l'homme ne comptait plus pour rien" (p. 505). The princes abandoned everything to their subordinates; malice, envy, hatred and vengeance had full sway; the slightest suspicion became a certainty and the lightest indications caused public report which reached the ears of the princes. Quotes Spee, at considerable length as to the injustice of the trials (pp. 505–11).

Praises Spee and Meyfart, to whose labors it was due that at the beginning of the eighteenth century there was no longer a trace of these horrible proceedings. The merit of these two men is to have placed limits on the excessive credulity of the time, but unfortunately, by a reaction common in such matters, this credulity was replaced by a skepticism of which the results were still more deplorable (p. 516).—Ib., c. 45 (pp. 503–16).

Matters had reached a point where the means employed to cure the evil were worse than the evil itself (p. 517). The princes and especially the Church were accused of the excesses practiced in the witch-trials. It was said that the popes, particularly Innocent VI [VIII], had given the signal and that the Inquisition had sought for victims like a famished lion. But it was not the laws which caused the evil, it was the manner of their execution (p. 518). All impartial men must recognize that the popes have acted with kindness and moderation in comparison with the secular power (p. 519). Quotes at length the Instructions of 1657 (pp. 519–25). By a queer confusion of thought he illustrates this by a long account of the torments inflicted on Soeur Jeanne (of Loudun) by Père Surin, which he calls a therapeutic process to drive out five possessing devils—as though the energumen were a sorceress (pp. 526–8).—Ib., c. 46 (pp. 517–28).

This is the end of Görres' work—followed by an Epilogue by the translator, Charles de Sainte-Foi.

In this Sainte-Foi says the reader will be convinced that these phenomena have never ceased in the world. Sometimes they are more numerous and striking than at others. At times by divine permission the abyss of hell seems to open and the action of the devil betrays itself by signs so manifest that there can be no illusion as to their nature (p. 529). Never perhaps were mystic phenomena more frequent or more widespread. We must take care not too easily to attribute the extraordinary effects of magnetism and som-

nambulism to angels or demons, but it would be as unreasonable to deny that the infernal powers may often take part, for among the effects are many which evidently exceed the limits of science and the natural powers of men (p. 531). The explanation of trickery has been advanced, but that is of all, in our opinion, the most futile and absurd (p. 533). People no longer believe in the demon and that is undeniably one of the most decisive signs of his power and his action (p. 534). Never perhaps has the action of the demon been more profound and more manifest than today. At the bottom of society, in those abysses of darkness and corruption which adjoin those of hell, monstrous things are done, things which would make us despair of the future of the world, if, alongside of these prodigies of evil, good had not also its heroes and its miracles. The cult of Satan is formally practiced in Europe, especially in certain parts and certain cities where impiety and atheism have made most progress (p. 535).

Thus in the depths of society, under our feet, the mysteries of hell are celebrated. The devil has his adepts, his priests, his initiators, his cult, his ceremonies, his practices and his morals. Novices are initiated in this abominable cult in the same manner as formerly, by a solemn pact in which they renounce God and heaven and declare themselves vassals of Satan. Today, as formerly, they sign with their blood this sacrilegious pact (p. 536).

This explains the facility with which were accepted by the Church and its highest authorities the audacious mystifications of Leo Taxil which would seem too absurd for human credulity in its extreme extension.

The cult of the demon is today connected with certain practices of theurgy and necromancy which recall sensibly those of paganism (p. 538).

Winds up with a number of cases of modern ecstatics, whose trances and performances show that the mysticism of the sixteenth century has revived and flourishes in spite of the condemnation of Quietism (pp. 540–54).—Épilogue du Traducteur (vol. v, pp. 529–54).

Görres has a worthy disciple in Paul M. Baumgarten, a zealous Catholic, who justifies the prosecution of witches and who attributes the abuses of the witch-trials to the anti-Christian tendencies of the Renaissance and Reformation and the wickedness and greed of the judges. According to him a fundamental element of religious belief is that there is an

invisible spiritual kingdom comprehending the devils or demons who labor to injure, physically and morally, those who cling to God and lead them to revolt. They can work on material Nature and on the spiritual faculties of the soul in a manner outside of the ordinary order of things, but their labors are subject to the permission of God and are definitely limited. Man can coöperate with the demon in his strife with God, and the highest grade of this is when he places himself of free-will in the demon's service and similarly avails himself of the demon's help. It is not to be questioned that this, which is commonly called pact with the demon, is reciprocal between man and the demon. The sorcery connected with heresy became terribly extended in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and it was the duty of the popes and bishops as well as of the princes to combat these horrors. To leave these crimes unpunished was to abandon social and religious order to destruction.[1]—Baumgarten, Paul M., Die deutschen Hexenprozesse, Frankfurt a. M., 1883 (from Snell, *Hexenprozesse und Geistesstörung*, München, 1891, pp. 61–2).

Scavini asks, concerning demons, "Sane nonne, Deo permittente, nobis ubique insidiantur et diu noctuque circuunt quaerentes quem devorent?" *Maleficium*, he says, is either *amatorium* or *veneficum*, "et est ipsa praecise ars nocendi alicui variis modis, v. g. morbos suscitando, tempestates producendo, etc."—Scavini, Theologia Moralis Universa (5. ed., Neapoli, 1853), II, p. 121 (1. ed., 1847).

He even goes further and asserts as to witches: "Lamiae dicuntur illae perditi moris mulieres quae ope daemonum hominibus insidiantur, noxia quaeque contra ipsos moliendo omni incantationum et maleficiorum genere. Non ignoramus temporibus hisce nostris quosdam esse qui, se praejudiciis vacuos jactantes, affirmare non dubitant inter aniles fabellas esse amandandum quidquid ab hominibus ope daemonis peractum referatur. . . . Imo docent Theologi opiniones istas esse etiam periculosas in se et valde injuriosas Ecclesiae Catholicae, quippe quae contra lamias sive striges poenas indixit gravissimas."—Ib., p. 122.

The significance of this lies in the fact that the book is dedicated to Pius IX and is prefaced by a letter from the pope accepting the dedication and warmly urging the author to continue his labors for the edification of the faithful.

[1] This comment on Baumgarten, whose book Mr. Lea did not himself possess, is based wholly on the words of Snell and is interesting as Mr. Lea's only mention of a scholar who was to figure notably among his own critics.

Under Pius IX the Inquisition repeatedly issued edicts commanding under pain of excommunication the denunciation of those who ate meat, butter or eggs on fast days or practised sorcery or entered into pacts with the demon.—Döllinger, Kleinere Schriften, p. 590.

In the most authoritative exposition of modern German orthodoxy, the editor, Franz Kaulen, Professor of Theology in Bonn, argues that not all the confessions of witches were extorted by torture; the Can. Episcopi does not infer that all such midnight flights were illusions. It must be conceded that the question of the reality of witchcraft cannot be wholly answered. We can only investigate in each case from the proceedings whether the accused was guilty or not of the crime alleged. The possibility of the matters collectively classed as witchcraft cannot be denied. Jos. v. Görres, in his Mystik, IV, 2, has proved this on internal grounds. As external grounds the investigations of the great medieval moralists may well serve, in so far as their *Casuistik* is evidently connected with the experiences of the confessional.[1] Spee, while asserting the innocence of most of those condemned whom he served as confessor, admits that the pact with the demon cannot be denied without gross lack of reason in special cases. —Kaulen, in Wetzer and Welte's Kirchenlexicon (2. ed., Freiburg i. B., 1888), V, pp. 1991–2.

Archbishop Kenrick says, "Maleficium vocatur ratio aliis nocendi opera daemonis." Divided into *amatorium* and *veneficum*. Many English writers treat it as delirious dreams, but many decrees of the canon law show that the demon sometimes intervenes in human affairs. "Quapropter justissime legibus olim coercebantur, quamvis a poena mortis ob hujusmodi artes omnino abhorreamus. Ex impunitate qua gaudent in regionibus Protestanticis fit ut pecunia ancillas emungant, et foeda nonnumquam faciant vel doceant facienda."—Kenrick, Theologia Moralis (Mechliniae, 1861), II, p. 19.

The following extracts from Father Gury, S. J., will show that there has been no change in teaching since the sixteenth century and that sorcery is assumed to be as absolute a fact and its powers as harmful, with the aid of the demon, as Del Rio or the Malleus taught.

After explaining that white magic or natural magic is worked "absque ullo daemonis ministerio," he proceeds:

"271.—I. . . . Magia, *stricte* dicta, est ars mira faciendi, quae

[1] The original says: " . . . in so fern dieselben ihre Casuistik lediglich an die wirklichen Erfahrungen der Beichtväter anknüpfen."

licet non supernaturalia sint, vires tamen hominis superant, et proinde ope solius daemonis explicite vel implicite invocati fieri possunt.

"II. Maleficium est ars nocendi daemonis interventu.

"Duplex distinguitur, scilicet *amatorium* et *veneficum*. Maleficium *amatorium*, seu *philtrum*, est ars diabolica, qua lubricus amor vel odium in aliqua persona erga aliam vehementer excitatur. Maleficium *veneficum* est praecise ars proximo nocendi ope daemonis, idque variis modis, v. gr., morbis, hebetudine, etc.—*S. Lig. n.* 23.

"Maleficium vulgo vocatur *sortilegium*, ex eo quod per illud sors mala iniiciatur iis, contra quos vindicta, per operationem diabolicam, exercetur. Hinc in Iure canonico et in historia ecclesiastica magi et sagae *sortiarii* et *sortiariae* vocantur.

"272.—1° Magia non differt a vana observantia nisi in eo quod eius effectus sint magis miri, v. gr., immutatio corporum, etc. . . .

"2° Maleficium autem differt specie ab aliis superstitionibus ex eo quod, praeter peccatum Religioni oppositum, damnum proximi inducat. . . .

"*Quaer. An peti possit a mago ut maleficium tollat?*

"*Resp. Neg.*, nisi rationabiliter praesumi possit illud mediis naturalibus auferendum esse. *Ita communiter Theologi.—S. Lig. n. 24 et 25.*"—Gury, Compendium Theologiae Moralis (17. ed., Romae, 1866), I, pp. 266–7.

In another work Gury discusses the question in a case of conscience. A girl marries a man against the opposition of her aunt, a woman of evil repute, who threatens her with the result. The husband as soon as married takes his wife in bitter aversion, who applies to her aunt for a remedy; the aunt demands 100 crowns to break the spell. The question is whether this is the result of sorcery and whether the payment for release is licit. Gury decides that it is a case of sorcery "In omnibus retroactis temporibus exstitere perversi homines, qui, horrendo foedere cum diabolo inito, ejus opere miro et stupenti modo vindictam in alios exercebant. Cur vero in nostra tam perversa aetate nulli hujusmodi magi et sortilegi exstarent?" But caution is to be exercised, for credulous people often attribute natural evils to sorcery. As to the remedy, he distinguishes—if the spell can be removed by natural means it is lawful; but not if a new *maleficium* is necessary, for thus the sorcerer is led to new commerce with the devil.—Id., Casus Conscientiae in praecipuas Quaestiones Theologiae Moralis (Ratisbonae, 1865), pp. 81–2.

"Nota 2° Parochi, concionatores et catechistae cavere sedulo debent ne fideles alloquantur de variis sortilegiis et superstitionibus vulgo incognitis, sed brevem habeant sermonem tantum de iis, quae in illa regione nota sunt, ne ea edoceant potius quam ab iis avertant."—Id., Compendium Theologiae Moralis, I, p. 267.

"*Quaer. 4° Quaenam sint signa verae possessionis?*

"*Resp.* Praecipua sunt: 1° loqui idiomate prorsus ignoto ante tempus possessionis; 2° occulta et distantia manifestare, quae naturaliter ab homine cognosci nequeunt; 3° parere mandato mere interno Sacerdotis, etc.; 4° experiri maiorem daemonis vexationem, aut maiorem pacem ex contactu prorsus ignorato rerum sacrarum, etc." While thus accepting full belief in possession by demons he adds the significant caution: "*Nota.* Non facile generatim credendus est aliquis a daemone possideri, quia verae possessiones nostris temporibus rarae sunt, et pleraeque ex iis, quae perhibentur, falsae inveniuntur."—Ib., p. 350.

That this is the seventeenth edition sufficiently shows the wide use of the work as a text-book in the seminaries, and it is easy to estimate the effect on an immature mind of having these absolute assertions impressed upon the memory, as aphorisms for guidance through life. Brief as they are, they comprise all upon which was erected the structure of the witch-craze—even to the *immutatio corporum* which was sometimes disputed and explained away by illusion—except intercourse with incubi and succubi, about which he discreetly says nothing in his chapter De Luxuria. Gury was a Jesuit.

Antoine Bonal admits that rationalists and even some Catholics deny the existence of magic and pact with the demon, but he lays down the assertion: "Existit magia, seu commercium cum daemone, ex pacto sive expresso, sive tacito. Hoc negari nequit citra temeritatis notam, juxta Suarez, Perrone et alios communiter. . . . Et vero diabolus Deum in omnibus aemulatur. Sicut ergo Deus per signa quaedam sensibilia gratiam confert atque fovet divinum cultum; ita et daemon signis utitur ut cum ipso societas contrahatur, sicque ad aliquem cultum et venerationem erga se ipsum inducat."—Bonal, Institutiones Theologicae ad usum Seminariorum (Tolosae, 1882), II, pp. 388, 390.

Again he recurs to it: "Magia, ex ibidem dictis, est *ratio mira operandi, daemonis industria;* et ideo semper implicat aliquod pactum sive expressum sive tacitum cum daemone." Express pact consists in doing that in which it is known that the demon must coöperate, "sive sit petitio simplex sine ulla

promissione vel pacto ex parte petentis, sive adjunctum habeat pactum expressum, quo petens se obligat ad obsequium daemonis aut ad perpetuam cum eo societatem, si ad divinandum vel operandum adjuvet."—Ib., V, pp. 466–7.

That this work is largely used in the seminaries is evident from the fact that this is the fourteenth edition. When young aspirants for the priesthood are trained in this belief its persistence requires no explanation.

Clemens Marc naturally follows his authority, Liguori, but merely alludes to *maleficium* among other causes of impotence—"accidentalis quae provenit ex vitio extrinseco eventuali, v. g. ex morbo, maleficio, actu violento"—as an impedimentum dirimens, and makes no further allusion to it.—Marc, Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, §2008 (Romae, 1893), II, p. 488.

Marc necessarily treats sorcery as a substantive fact. "Maleficium est vis nocendi aliis, ex pacto et cooperatione daemonis. Qui maleficiis utuntur, vulgo vocantur *sortilegi.*" But he warns: "Maleficiis non est facile adhibenda fides, nisi res sedulo examinata fuerit."—Ib., §571 (I, p. 396). Yet it must always be kept in mind, for among the practical rules for confessors, "Circa maleficia et magiam *interrogandi* sunt opiliones, fabri ferrarii, rustici, qui sanant jumenta vel pecora; item, vetulae quaedam jure suspectae."—Ib., §573 (p. 397).

It is easy to see how thus the belief is propagated and kept alive, if the confessor makes it his business to inquire after it.

Caramuel seems to be the first to cast doubt upon the existence of incubi and succubi—"Tertius est bestialitas, quae gravior adhuc reliquis est. Huic nonnulli Daemonialitatem seu concubitum cum Daemone adjungunt, de quo non libenter tractabo; quia multa de Sagis lego, plura audio, quae non videntur omnino vera, et aliqua quae nec possibilia.—Caramuel y Lobkowicz, Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis, n. 1670 (Romae, 1656), II, p. 131. (1. ed., Francofurti, 1651.)

Yet this does not prevent him soon after from defining it as a double sin, combining lust and sacrilege—"nunquam enim hoc scelus committitur sine pacto contractu et amicitia hominis Daemonisque; et quaecunque daemonis invocatio, advocatio, confoederatio et amicitia, peccatum gravissimum est."—Ib., n. 1677 (p. 133).

And he alludes to it again as a special sin.—Ib., n. 1692 (p. 138).

All the Catholic theologians maintain the belief [in incubi].

Liguori, after giving the section of Busenbaum defining it, proceeds—"Bene ait *Bus.* quod congressus cum Daemone reducitur ad peccatum bestialitatis, ut dicunt etiam *Tamb.* l. c., *Elbel* n. 262, cum *Bon. Fill.* et *Salm.* n. 141 cum *Caj. Az.* et *Trull.* Praeter autem crimen bestialitatis accedit scelus superstitionis. An autem qui coit cum Daemone apparente in forma conjugatae, monialis, aut consanguineae, peccet semper affective peccato adulterii, sacrilegii, aut incestus? Videtur universe affirmare *Bus. cum aliis ut supra*; sed valde probabiliter negandum, si concumbens delectetur de muliere illa a Daemone repraesentata, non qua nupta, aut moniali, sed qua pulchra, juxta sententiam *Lugonis, Pal. Vasq.* et aliorum plurium, qui valde probabiliter docent, quod delectatio morosa non involvit speciem objecti, de quo aliquis delectatur, nisi circumstantia personae intret in delectationem; *vide l. 5, n. 15.*"—St. Alphonsus de Ligorio, Theologia Moralis, lib. iii, tract. iv, c. 2, dub. 3, n. 475 (Romae, 1767), p. 171.

Shows how all details and accessory points have been discussed and threshed out with a full belief in reality. Liguori was canonized in 1839 and elevated to the supreme rank of a Doctor of the Church in 1871.

Scavini follows Liguori, though in a condensed shape.—Petrus Scavini, Theologia Moralis Universa, tract. iv, disp. 2, c. 3, art. 1, §2 (ed. 1853), I, p. 474.

Marc of course does the same, but with some addition—"Ad bestialitatem revocatur *peccatum cum daemone* succubo vel incubo. Superadditur huic peccato malitia contra religionem; et praeterea malitia sodomiae affectivae aut fornicationis, si daemon apparuerit in forma pueri aut mulieris; adulterii aut incestus, si in forma mulieris nuptae, consanguineae aut affinis."—Marc, Institutiones Morales Alphonsianae, n. 805 (ed. 1893), I, p. 543.

Martinet, who belongs to a more rigorous school than the Ligorians, after quoting Busenbaum argues vigorously against the modern scepticism which denies the possibility of intercourse with spirits. We are not to obey those who are more expert in natural science than in demonology for various reasons. There is the reverence due to the universal consensus of theologians, whose universal knowledge of things divine, angelic and human and especially their experience in the arts of the Old Serpent exceed altogether those of doctors of medicine and physiology; there is all that Catholic faith teaches of the necessity [*necessitudine, i. e.*, relationship] of

angels with men and of the infestations of demons. It is given to Satan and his angels to spread all kinds of snares before men; there is no sin to which the children of Adam are more inclined than to lust, and this is the more ardently excited by the sight and touch of bodies appropriate to it than by aught else. Therefore "vere mirum foret daemones ab hujusmodi tentationum genere semper abstinuisse. Ne anilibus fabulis annumeretur machinatio illa *spirituum immunditiae*, contra communem traditionem, non modo scholarum theologiae et utrisque juris medii aevi, sed totius mundi christiani et gentilis, obstat axioma: *Nullus dari potest error universalis, qui non sit vero subnixus.* Obstant demum, in singulis seculis, etiam in nostro, permulta facta, iis insignita testimoniis et notis, quae nullum videntur locum relinquere sive incredulitati, sive scientificis interpretationibus physiologorum."—A. Martinet, Institutionum Theologicarum quarta Pars, seu Theologia Moralis, lib. v, art. 10, §4 (Parisiis, 1867), IV, pp. 37–8.

August Vilmar, Professor of Theology at Marburg, 1855–68, teaches the reality of the kingdom of Satan and of sorcery and witchcraft. He entered upon his professorship with the determination to spread this belief throughout Hesse. In his *Die Theologie der Thatsachen wider die Theologie der Rhetorik* (Marburg, 1856) he speaks of seeing the grin and hearing the sneers of the devil from the abyss with the physical senses, and not symbolically, and he deplores the absence of this teaching from modern Dogmatics and Ethics. In his Lectures, posthumously published by Gymnasialdirektor Piderit (Hanau, 1874), he tells his students that the devil has an organized kingdom opposed to the kingdom of God and has great troops of subordinate demons through whom he works on men. He quotes Scripture to prove the truth of Possession, which in most cases extends to possession also of the soul, unless adequate means are used to prevent it—means adapted to withstand the devil—and he obtains possession of the mind and spirit, leading men to error and delusion so that spiritual means lose their power and the devil seizes the soul. It is true blindness that ascribes these things to melancholia. Who has once seen a demoniac cannot for a moment be in doubt as to the distinction between possession and delusion. In many cases, though not in all, the voice of the demon can be distinguished from that of the possessed and there is the speaking, or at least the understanding of

foreign unlearnt languages, clairvoyance, wonderful mobility of the limbs and loss of weight. . . . Connected with this is the influence of the devil on nature for the injury of man, and the ability of those men who have abandoned God and given themselves to the devil to work on nature—namely Sorcery, which according to Scripture and experience cannot be regarded as delusion.—Soldan-Heppe, II, pp. 341–50.

So in his *Dogmatik* (I, pp. 266–7) Vilmar says that men who surrender themselves unconditionally to the Evil One can work false miracles. This is the darker province of Sorcery, to which we must ascribe full reality. These kinds of miracles are directed essentially to overthrow the world of salvation, to arouse fear, to work material injury. . . . We can thus formulate [or describe] the tendency of this infernal power: all belongs to sorcery, which tends (1) to obtain power over the self-determination of men (over their spirits) without God's word and without prayer; (2) to excite the forces of Nature; (3) to know the far-off and the future; (4) to inflict material injury without material means. Yet the acceptance of these hellish powers conflicts with the government of the world by God as little as does Evil. It is only the higher potentiality of Evil.—Ib., p. 351.

Vilmar in his *Zur neuesten Kulturgeschichte Deutschlands* (Frankfurt a. M., 1867) derives medieval witchcraft from the old heathen beliefs and customs. Its origin, he says, is not from empty illusions, foolish dreams and childish stories, but from practical situations and palpable conditions which, like the days and places of assemblage, are still clearly recognizable. . . . The battle against witchcraft and witches is nothing else than that which today exists between faith and infidelity, between the confession and the denial of Christ, between love and hatred of the Saviour. The conflict lasted for centuries until the Thirty Years' War, when the witch-persecution came to an end, when infidelity among the lower classes came to an end and the higher classes lost their faith. . . . No age save our own so abounded in shameless and atrocious blasphemy and wild defiance of God as the latter half of the fifteenth, the sixteenth and the first half of the seventeenth centuries. Towards the end of the fifteenth century this revolt against God by witches grew to unwonted proportions, not only in Germany but also in France and Italy, clothing itself in the forms of the ancient Roman and Celtic heathenism. Thence arose the pact with the devil and the intercourse with incubi and succubi (apparently he

accepts all this—H. C. L.). Perhaps the larger half of these connections and sorceries were delusions arising from the tendency to revolt, but nevertheless the lesser and more important half were true facts.—Soldan-Heppe, II, pp. 389–91.

Vilmar, from the autumn of 1855 to his death in 1868, taught these opinions to numerous audiences who swore by him and are still in the service of the Evangelical Church of Hesse.—Ib., p. 351.

Vilmar was not alone in this. Längin, Protestant pastor in Karlsruhe, mentions as Protestant assertors of witchcraft Splittberger, Mühe and Röschen.—Snell, Hexenprozesse und Geistesstörung, p. 63.

Vilmar says that the limits to which, at the end of the fifteenth century, the propensity of many women, especially old ones, to injure others, extended, is incalculable and would be wholly beyond belief if there were not the most impartial and trustworthy testimony. The cessation of witch persecution he attributes to the indifferentism which after 1660 pervaded the lower orders.—Soldan-Heppe, II, pp. 391–2.

II. Modern Popular Beliefs.

I suppose we may accept the following translation of the text [in Genesis] as presenting the modern Jewish acceptation of the myth of the Fall of the Angels:

"The sons of the gods saw the daughters of men that they were fair, and they took them wives of all whom they chose. And the Eternal said, My spirit shall not forever pronounce judgment against man through their backslidings; he is only flesh, therefore his days shall be an hundred and twenty years. There were the giants (Nephilim—fallen ones, in footnote) in the earth in those days; and also after that, when the sons of the gods came unto the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them, these are the heroes who were of old men of name" (Gen., vi, 2–4).—Benisch, Jewish School and Family Bible. Newly translated under the supervision of the Rev. the Chief Rabbi of the United Congregations of the British Empire, 2. ed., London, 1852.

The same work translates Gen., iii, 1–4, simply as serpent, "more subtle than any animal of the field which the Eternal God has made. And it said unto the woman," etc.

Nippold, Friedrich.—*Die gegenwärtige Wiederbelebung des Hexenglaubens.* Berlin, 1875.

Nippold describes the curious modern reactionary tendency to belief in supernatural intervention, not only in Catholic but in Lutheran circles. The existence of the devil is no longer a mere theoretical belief, but in some quarters his active intervention in human affairs is taught and the endeavor is made to include this in the instruction of the young. In this connection he alludes to the names of Windthorst, Hodenberg, Höe von Hoënegg and Dr. Fritz, and especially to the Catechism of Walther, the use of which it has been attempted to impose upon the people. This makes the devil the tempter to sin, not only by illusions but by actual interposition. Man can, knowingly or unknowingly, come into direct relations with the devil, and under references to soothsayers, diviners, conjurers and sorcerers the basis is laid on which the old witch-craze was erected. This Catechism, he says, is also highly esteemed in America (pp. 6–7).

There is not in Protestantism, however, the power of external pressure that exists in Catholicism (p. 8).

Among the faculties issued by the papal Penitentiary is that of absolving from sentences and penalties for invocation of the demon, not only the simple but those formally surrendering the soul to him, under condition of annulling the pact and surrendering the written pact (p. 9).

In 1860 a witch was publicly burnt in Camargo, Mexico. In 1874 on May 7, at S. Juan de Santiago in Sinaloa, Diega Lugo and her son Geronimo Porres were burnt alive for sorcery. The official report of this by the judge, J. Moreno, May 10, 1874, to the governor deplores the necessity of the act, [but accepts that necessity] in order to check the wickedness apparent from time to time. Another of the accused, J. M. Mendoza, said that we would sooner or later regret it, but he has fled, which is proof of his guilt (pp. 11–12).

Previous to this Jose Maria Bonitta and his wife had been burnt; also a young woman with her child; she had vomited hairs, laid a cross of straw in the highway and avoided houses protected by horseshoes. Another prosecution took place in the town of Concordia (Sinaloa) but result not reported (p. 12).

Lecky (q. v., Rationalism[1]) tells of a case at Tarbes in 1850 where the Soubervie, husband and wife, were tried for the murder of the *femme* Bedouret. The priest had told them she was the cause of the illness of the wife. They held

[1] History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, I, p. 30 n. 1.

her over burning straw and thrust a red hot-iron into her mouth and she died in extreme torment. They made no concealment and exulted in what they had done and brought witnesses of the best class in their defence and were supported by the highest ecclesiastical officials. The jury recommended them to mercy and they were sentenced to four months' prison and a yearly payment of 25 fr. to the widower (pp. 12–13).

At Zweibrücken (Bipont.) 7 August, 1874, there was a prosecution against the wife of Johann Frenzel of Trulben for defaming Margaretha Klein, whom she accused of bewitching her and her child. The proceedings showed how unalterably fixed were the beliefs concerning witchcraft. Then at Aachen, March 23, 1875, there was a case arising from a bewitched cow, which was finally restored to health by the use of consecrated things, in which a carpenter and a priest figured. The *Kölnische Zeitung* of April 25, 1875, reported a case in the village of H. in Oberelsass where the Bürgermeister cured his bewitched wife through the advice of a sorcerer and a novena (pp. 13–14).

Evidently the belief is as flourishing as ever, though ignored in the statute-book.

It is impossible to relieve the priesthood of responsibility for this. When they are of the school of Wessenberg or Spiegel these superstitions are assailed, but the priests of Jesuit training are so inoculated with it that they encourage it. The daily reading of the Breviary has much influence and the mind is prepared for this by schooling in convents and seminaries. We need only refer to the accounts of demoniac influence, of the cudgelling of novices by demons and of the more susceptible youths, who in the presence of the rest have bodily struggles with unseen antagonists and loud conversations with the devil (p. 17).

In support of this he quotes Gury, whose book is highly thought of in ultramontane circles and largely used in seminaries (pp. 17–18).

I have one or two things elsewhere from his Casus Conscientiae, but not from his Theologia Moralis,[1] in which he follows St. Alphonsus Liguori.

Nippold gives extracts from Andreas Gassner's *Modus juvandi afflictos a Daemone*, 1869, a work recommended by

[1] But see pp. 1520–1.

the highest ecclesiastical authorities. Like Gury, Gassner warns the priest against too great credulity, but his warning indicates the all-pervading belief in the activity of the demon —"If all who believe themselves to be suffering from demonic disease were really demonic, almost the whole world would be possessed by demons, especially the female sex" (p. 21).

This doubtless alludes to *maleficiati* in general as well as demoniacs.

"It is well to observe that these infestations are usually in connection with natural diseases or weakness, physical, psychical and moral, whence it results that one easily passes under demonic influence and when natural remedies fail the evil is pronounced incurable when perhaps in a short time it could be perfectly cured if natural and supernatural means were combined against the conjoined evils—benedictions, exorcisms, taking communion, sprinkling holy water on the medicines or, better still, having them blessed by the priest. As a rule spiritual means are as little effective in curing psychical affections as physical remedies are in demonic infestations. . . . Finally it is clear that demons, who naturally are filthy, select as basis for their destructive influence the moral filth in which they feel at home.—Gassner, quoted by Nippold, p. 22.

Gassner defines all these troubles as "afflictiones" and divides the "afflicti" into three classes—*maleficiati, obsessi* and *possessi.* The *maleficiati* are divisible into two groups—those injured in property and those in person, the latter being also called *facturati* or *maliati.* The former group is of those injured in their cattle, their harvests, etc., by diabolical influence; the latter those whose body or a member the demon pierces, causing pains or movements; articles by diabolical influence are conveyed into the body, which are called *maleficium* or *veneficium* and are either injurious or otherwise—fragments of glass, feathers and the like. This is the lightest grade. The second consists of the *obsessi,* in whose body an evil spirit has not wholly entered; he is not absolutely in possession but is striving for it as an enemy besieging a town. The highest grade is that of the *possessi,* into whose bodies an evil spirit has entered and is in possession of all or nearly all the members.—Ib., p. 23.

Then there are those whose house or rooms are molested with diabolical manifestations and also those "qui daemoni se subscripserunt, vel eum in vitro aut alio vase inclusum

detinent et ab eo utut vellent liberari nequeunt, item qui habent spiritum incubum vel succubum."—Ib., p. 24.

Maleficiati are divided into five classes—adults, children, married folk, animals and other objects—in order to determine the signs and methods of ascertaining whether they are molested by evil spirits or not. There follows a queer jumble of signs of *maleficium*—if a man shows disgust for food that has been secretly blessed; if his breath has a hellish stench of sulphur, pitch and the like; if unnatural sounds are heard in his body, such as the croaking of frogs; if children cry all night without discoverable cause or constantly suckle and yet grow thin; if beasts refuse their fodder or a cow's milk yields no butter, etc., etc.—Ib., p. 24.

These signs are quoted from Anaclet Reiffenstuel's Theologia Moralis, tract. 14, dist. 8, append. 1, addit. 1 and 2 (ed. Antverpiae, 1758), II, p. 128.

The signs of obsession and possession are the same as Gury's with some additions, as, for instance, "si saepius videat daemonem sub diversis formis, puta gigantis, aethiopis, vetulae, canis, ursi, cati, etc., sibi apparentem, signum est diabolum tentare ingressum vel jam actu corpus possidere."—Ib., p. 26.

When the priest is unable personally to visit the person or place possessed by the demon he can write out the exorcism and send it, but while writing he must wear his stole.—Ib., p. 29.

When a person is cured it is a preservative to hang up written exorcisms over the door, window, etc.—Ib., p. 30.

Gassner gives exorcisms "circa maleficiatos infantes," for demon-infested houses, for cattle, for milk and butter, for crops, for married folk who are ligatured (p. 35) and for the "maleficium variorum morborum."—Ib., p. 31.

When medicines are employed they should be blessed, for the demon seeks in various ways to prevent their working.—Ib., p. 32.

In the *licentia exorcisandi* issued by the bishop there is a prohibition to exorcise between May 1 and November 1, for the reason that when the demon is expelled he is apt to express his displeasure by exciting tempests, hailstorms and the like to the destruction of the harvests, and the benefit of one should not prevail over the injury of the community.—Ib., p. 33.

In this the "permission of God" would seem to be lost sight of.

Nippold gives (pp. 71–4) extensive extracts from Perty's *Mystische Erscheinungen des Seelenlebens* which show that, even before modern developments of hypnotism, it was recognized that demoniac possession and the marvels of witchcraft, vampirism and zoanthropy (lycanthropy) were studied as conditions of psychical disease, inducing hallucinations of all kinds. He also alludes to W. von Waldbrühl's *Naturforschung und Hexenglaube.*

Frischbier, H.—*Hexenspruch und Zauberbann. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Aberglaubens in der Provinz Preussen.* Berlin, 1870.

In Prussia the people no longer believe in the Sabbat and laugh at the wonderful stories of the multiform arts of witches (p. 1).

This is wholly in contradiction with Jahn's statements as to the contiguous province of Pomerania.

The former belief accepted the Sabbat and held that the evil deeds of witches were done for them by the demons whom they possessed—male for women and female for men. These demons were procured either by purchase or gift. A man could give one to his daughter as a portion. If the possessor cast off a demon, the latter would make him suffer. To get rid of him safely he must be sold or given away. The usual price was from 1 to 3 Prussian gulden (3 gulden = 1 thaler—H. C. L.). The transfer was commonly effected in tow placed in a basket (p. 2, n.).

At the same time in modern Prussia there is a lively belief in sorcery. The sorcerer may be predestined or he may acquire the *Teufelskunst* or may inherit it (p. 1). To cause sickness or death, the sorcerer may pray for three successive Sundays behind the altar, partly with certain songs and partly with a maledictory psalm recited backwards and naming the person at the end of each verse. A small offering must also be made at the altar. Persons can be also sung to death, by singing a certain song morning and evening for a year. Another way is to throw after the victim bewitched hair or to strew it before a door through which he has to pass. Earth from the forks of a road gathered with certain conjurations and invocation of the devil serves to bewitch cattle and milk. Disease is also caused by casting a powder, by casting the ashes of a burnt toad mixed with particles of a consecrated Host.

A limb may be crippled by thrice stroking it with the hand and reciting certain verses—preferably on a holy day in the waning of the moon. Or the sorcerer can do this by simply breathing on it. The winding-sheet of a corpse is also powerful to bewitch man and beast. Water in which a toad has been boiled, when poured over cattle with a certain formula, is also efficacious. Lilies of the valley buried under the threshold of the stall will bewitch the cattle and milk. Discord can be caused between a new-married pair by taking a lock into the church at the wedding and locking it at the moment when the "yes" is uttered, and then burying the key. Until the lock and key are brought together there will be discord between them (pp. 4–7).

Bewitchment is easily detected. Healthy children begin to wither, or frequently to cry, healthy cattle become sick (p. 8).

Evidently any unexpected misfortune is ascribed to sorcery.

The evenings of St. John's day and Christmas are especially dangerous, for then the witches are especially active (p. 11). Precautions taken between Christmas and Epiphany (pp. 13, 16).

As in Pommern there are innumerable ways of protecting oneself against sorcery—unnecessary to detail. Most of them are childish in the extreme. To guard against witches and the devil during the night it suffices to put the shoes just under the edge of the bed—in some places with the toes inwards—in others with them out (p. 10).

St. John'swort is a valuable protective (p. 12).

There is an equally long enumeration of remedies and of revenges on the witch. Thus, if a cow dies of sorcery, the owner cuts out the heart, pierces it with nine needles and hangs it in the chimney. Then at once the witch comes and begs for it on some pretext, for her heart is pierced in the same way. If her request is refused, she takes to her bed and wastes away. After nine days the dried heart is removed and the witch simultaneously dies (p. 20).

If a person is bewitched, a black hen is taken and torn living limb from limb in silence. It is put into a new pot which has been bought without bargaining as to price and the lid is firmly fastened down. This is put on to boil while every opening in the house is closed, even the keyholes. Only the patient and the conjurer are to be in the room; they are to

preserve silence and he is not to be frightened whatever happens and he must keep close watch lest the pot be stolen up the chimney. When the pot begins to boil, there will come a knocking at the door and a demand for entrance, which is delayed but at length permitted, and the witch enters. He commands her to cure the patient; she protests her innocence and he beats her until she restores the patient to health. She must endure this, for, if the cooking goes on until sunset, she dies (pp. 20–1).

It is the rarest thing to call in a physician for disease. It is either left to the hand of God or some superstitious cure is resorted to (p. 17).

Conjurers are in great request as possessing the secret charms and formulas. They are largely women. Families of skinners possess these secrets. Catholic priests are thought to be especially skilled in this. The Lithuanian turns not to his pastor, but brings a Catholic priest from elsewhere at great expense. The Protestant peasants in West Prussia similarly seek the aid of Catholic priests (p. 24). Lithuanians often ask their clergy to invoke some disease on an enemy (pp. 24–5).

JAHN, ULRICH.—*Hexenwesen und Zauberei in Pommern.* Breslau, 1886.

In popular belief there are three kinds of sorcery—white magic employed for the general benefit; black magic and witchcraft used for purposes of injury; and thirdly that devoted to the benefit of the individual, attributed to vagrants and criminals, to Freemasons and Jews (p. 3).

The first is highly esteemed and there is scarce anyone among the peasants and wage-earning class that does not have recourse to its adepts for counsel and assistance (p. 3).

To become a witch (male or female—Hex or Hexe) requires a teacher, and no old witch can refuse instruction, as she is bound to the devil to bring as many as she can to him and at least one before she dies. She buys a new pot, without chaffering over it, sets it on a table and the neophyte repeats an indecent and irreverent formula, whereupon the devil appears with a great book in which she must sign her name with her blood. She thus becomes a witch and her highest duty is to attend the Sabbat on the Walpurgisnacht on the Blocksberg—not that in the Hartz, but that name is given to numerous places in the vicinage of the villages. The way thither is by the chimney on broomsticks or the board used

to shove loaves into the oven or in sieves or in two-wheeled wagons drawn by goats or black cats. All she has to do is to mount her steed and say, "Auf und davon und nirgens an" and she is transported at once to the meeting place, which is a pleasant green space, where the devil sits enthroned while the witches dance around him to the sweetest music by demon performers. After the dance they feast on the best of food and drink that can be imagined, but it is all illusion, the meat is carrion, sometimes consisting of new-born children whose mothers neglect to baptize them immediately, or of human flesh (p. 7), and the musical instruments are tails of cats. Only one thing is genuine—pease, which always form part of the banquet. Then the devil instructs them. To those who are farmers he gives a piece of red cock's-comb to place under the churn, when a single cow will furnish more butter than a whole herd; he teaches them how to bring rain on their fields in drought with a ball of thread, and how to prevent others from making butter, no matter how hard they may labor; how by sticking an axe, a broomstick, a pig, etc., in the wall they can milk their neighbor's cows; how to bring sickness on their neighbors or on their cattle, or ill-luck; how to cause tempests, bring vermin such as mice and caterpillars to lay waste the fields, and fleas and lice to torment persons (pp. 5–6).

A host of other things—to become invulnerable, to cast bullets that will never miss, to win lawsuits, to cause strife between men, to render men impotent and women barren, to brew love-philtres, etc., etc. (p. 6).

He also teaches them to transform themselves into anything they choose, lifeless or living—a three-legged pot, a red-cheeked apple, a wolf, a cat, a frog, a fly, a wasp, a butterfly or any other animal or to a flaming broom flying through the air (p. 7).

But there are some exceptions to this—among fishes the pike, because on its head it bears the mark of the cross and the instruments of the Passion; among birds the dove, because the Holy Ghost took that form; among quadrupeds the lamb, the symbol of Christ; among insects the bee, for bees love righteousness and hate sorcery. Do what they may, witches have no luck with bees and never find a queen in their hives (p. 7).

When the witch is alone in her house and assured against intrusion she summons the devil, who appears in the form of

a black goat. Then follow love-passages which raise a man's hair to witness and when the devil is tired he lays his head on her bosom and she strokes his hair till he falls asleep (p. 7).

The witch also has a household demon at her service whom she treats and feeds well. He brings her from other houses pease, corn, straw, bacon and money; he spreads a good meal every day at noon and protects the house from all ill-luck (p. 8).

The devil proves himself a true protector of the witch throughout her life. At the time when witches were burnt he accompanied them to the stake in the shape of a raven and sought to prevent the wood from burning. It was only by driving him away that they could be burnt (p. 8).

Some witches, out of repentance, have burnt or buried the books in which they had written the magic arts taught them by the devil on the Blocksberg and have made the firm resolve to be done with it, but this has not helped them. The devil destroys their cattle and they lose all their property and when they die in beggary he takes their souls (p. 9).

Ordinarily the older a witch grows the worse she is. No one will assist a witch in her death-agony. I knew a case of a seventy-year-old woman living in a village near Stettin who was reckoned a witch all her life and held responsible for all sickness of men and beasts in the village. Just before her death in wild delirium she sprang from her bed and crawled on all fours to her neighbors, but no one thought of taking her back to her house. They shrunk from her in horror and the elders said to the younger, "See, children, that is the finger of God" (p. 9).

It is fortunate that there are means of recognizing witches. God distinguishes them by their eyes being always red and inflamed, they can look no one steadily in the face, and when alone in the street are always talking aloud to themselves. In church they leave for home before the benediction and suffer no one to accompany them. They are easily known by their evil hearts, rejoicing over any wickedness they have done more than over the choicest food (p. 9).

By watching on Walpurgisnacht one can see them flying through the air to the Blocksberg. Or on May day, by putting a bunch of ground-ivy on the breast or a chaplet of it on the head of a virgin going to church, one can recognize and name them. Or one can watch the women going to church; the honest ones wear hoods, the witches carry churns, basins and the

like on their heads; but one must be very prudent, for they know that they are detected; he must hasten from church before the preacher says amen, for if they catch him they will tear him in pieces, unless he swears not to betray them (p. 10).

But the recognition of witches is of little avail, men must protect themselves. As their power is greatest on May night, every one protects his house and stables by marking every door with a cross; a black cross with charcoal is the most effective, a red one is less so. When this is neglected, the witches in returning from the Blocksberg do every conceivable damage to men and cattle (pp. 10–11).

Not only on the May night is the cross efficacious. A cross made with the ladle on new butter prevents the witch from taking it. If the first sheaf of wheat in the barn is laid on a cross, the household demon of the witch cannot steal it. Various other protective uses of the cross for cattle, butter-making, etc. (p. 11).

The color red, symbolizing the blood of Christ, is also protective. Red bands around the necks of cattle and horses, or red threads twisted in their tails are used for this purpose. When the church is bewitched a red rag placed under it breaks the power of the witch. Salt, dill, caraway and flax-seed are excellent protectives against witchcraft. Many other plants also are effective and all are extensively used in various ways (pp. 11–13).

If an animal is bewitched to death, cut out the heart and fasten it in the chimney with nine new pins; as it becomes smoked, the witch will waste away and die. There are various other ways of treating the heart to punish the witch, of which this is the simplest (pp. 171–2).

The buckthorn is especially useful. With a stick of it a man can strike witches and demons and a witch does not dare to approach a vessel made of it (p. 13).

Animals are also useful—goose feet, tails of snakes, the gall of swine dried and mixed with fat are employed. The bear is especially efficient. Driven into a bewitched house he bellows and hastens to the spot where the charm is buried and digs it up with his paws. Bear leaders appreciate this and get fees for thus utilizing their animals (p. 13).

Frischbier says the same, *Hexenspruch und Zauberbann*, p. 8. The bear leaders persuade the peasants that their cattle are in danger and get from 1 to 10 dollars for averting or curing it.

There are metals which are protective. If a man buys a cow, she must tread on an axe when first entering the stall. When a cow is first driven to the meadow, on leaving the stable she must tread on an axe with the edge outwards and on returning on one with the edge inwards. A thaler placed in the churn prevents the butter from being bewitched (Jahn, pp. 13–14).

It is impossible to enumerate all the superstitions, general and local, connected with protection from witchcraft, or to imagine whence they individually arose and impressed the popular imagination. Especial faith is reposed on what are called thunderstones, supposed to be formed when lightning strikes the earth. One who is fortunate to find one and carries it always on his person is proof against witchcraft; and scrapings from it mixed with fodder will cure a bewitched cow. The same power is assigned to toad-stones—a name given to petrified sea-urchins. Even knot-holes in planks have a similar gift—looking through one at a bewitched cow will cure her (pp. 14–15).

In spite of all these simple protective and remedial things, perpetual watchfulness is necessary, for some witchcraft is so powerful that it kills before relief can be had. Prudent people are always on their guard against even the most trivial things. If a man buys a cow, he gives the seller a groschen over the price, saying "Herewith I buy the milk and butter" and feels safe that these cannot be bewitched away. Hair-cuttings are cast in the fire and egg-shells are broken into minute pieces lest witches make use of them. Nothing must be given from the house to a person of ill-repute, beg she ever so earnestly. Bride and bride-groom on the way to the wedding carry dill in their pockets as a safeguard and in the church they must sit so close together that no one can see between them, as otherwise witches can cause dissension (p. 15).

Persons knowing themselves to be the objects of witch-hatred, and especially bridal couples, wear their underclothing inside out. The peasant woman requires the cooper to place a woolen thread under one hoop of the churn; it counts as a hoop and prevents the witch, who is ignorant of it, from stealing the butter (p. 16).

A witch can be shot with silver or gold bullets. A leaden bullet rebounds from her skin and kills the marksman (p. 18).

The land is described as overrun with strolling tramps—

known as Charlottenburgers—artizans of all kinds, pretending to seek work, but living by beggary and petty thefts, in which they are extremely skilful. They have the reputation of sorcerers and the peasant women are liberal to them with food and drink and even money, for fear of their magic arts, of which the most monstrous stories are current among the people (p. 22).

These wonders they work through demons subjected to them (p. 23).

In popular belief the Freemasons are a body with the devil at its head. Every member on entering it must bind himself to the devil in writing with his blood. The devil serves him as a servant for a prescribed time, and when that has expired twists his neck. He can prolong the period, however, by buying from its parents a child and giving it to the devil, when the term is prolonged for as many years as the child would have lived, but this substitution can take place only once. Of late years, however, the devil has changed the arrangement. Every year the masons must cast lots, when the highest officer present drives a nail in the portrait of him on whom the lot falls. He falls dead and the devil takes his soul. Some say that the unlucky one can twice redeem himself with a substitute, but the third time is final. The result of all this is that Freemasons are feared and hated as the devil himself, and any sudden death is attributed to their bargain with him (pp. 24–6).

The saying is still true—"Es is kein Dörfchen so klein, es muss eine Hexe darin sein" (pp. 37–8).

One cause of the persistence of belief is the manner in which many pastors and teachers seek to combat it by denouncing it as service of the devil, which entails eternal damnation, whether it succeeds or not. This recognizes its power, and this is enough for the people (p. 39).

Krauss, Friedrich S.—*Slavische Volksforschungen.* Leipzig, 1908.

The special Slavic name for witch is vještica, masc. vještac, Russian vēdma. In many places, especially in Dalmatia, the use of the word vještica is avoided in the presence of children, and the euphemisms krstača and rogulja are employed. Among the Slovacs and Croats the German *Zauberin* has been modified into *copernica*, but its use is avoided for fear of exciting the anger of the witches, who would revenge themselves by

tearing the utterer to pieces at night and scattering his cattle. The name *maćionica* is derived from the Italian *magia*, there is also the *zlokobnica*, all of whom are described in the saying that every Wallachian woman who passes the age of forty is a vještica or at least a zlokobnica or a maćionica; that every perfected witch has a crossmark under the nose, every zlokobnica has hair on the chin and the maćionica's forehead is full of dark wrinkles and her face of blood-spots (pp. 31–2).

There is incredulity, however, in the Slavic proverb—"The old mother bewitched to keep off the frost and soon the snow was knee-deep" (p. 33).

After giving a copious list of words denoting sorcery and magic, Krauss remarks that their derivation shows them to have originally had a good significance of helping, curing, etc., and that the change of significance came from Western influences (p. 34).

The Vila or wood-maiden, Waldfrau (akin to fairies), was originally beneficial, the Holda of the plains and mountains, yet implacable when offended, persecuting men and crazing them. It is easy to understand how their evil qualities prevailed in the popular imagination and they gradually became witches (pp. 34–6).

Of these witches (Hexen) there are three kinds. The Lufthexen, who are evil and hostile to man; they terrify and drive men out of their senses, waylaying them at night and making them distracted. Then there are the Erdhexen, who are alluring and companionable, giving men good counsel. They are fond of pasturing the herds. The third kind are the Wasserhexen, very malicious to those whom they meet near or in the water, whirling them around till they drown, but when wandering over the land they are friendly to those whom they meet (p. 37).

There is a proverb—"Every old woman is a witch and every old man a wizard," which is rather confirmed by the saying, "Though she is an old woman, yet she is no witch." There is a proverb, "Every witch is of the devil's party," which means that she has given her soul to him and made pact with him, while the imprecation "May witches devour you" expresses the belief in the cannibalism of witches (pp. 37–8).

The witches regularly assemble on St. John's day (June 24), St. George's day (April 25), Christmas and Pentecost at crossroads and brew their magic potions. In pre-Christian times

the people celebrated St. George's day, Pentecost and St. John's day, the commencement and development of the renewal of nature, with sacrifices and ceremonies to ensure prosperity, when the wise-women fumigated men and cattle. Christianity accepted and altered these celebrations; the wise-women became witches and their practices became sorcery to work evil to man and beast. The crowning of the cattle with garlands has been retained, but it is as a protection from witches, and its omission is a serious matter, for these garlands are hung in the stalls to remain as guard until the following year (pp. 38–9).

Other superstitious observances to protect cattle from the ever-present danger of witches (pp. 39–40).

There is a story of two apprentice blacksmiths who with the wife of their master rode nightly to the Sabbat on one of their comrades whom they changed into a horse in punishment for his inconsiderate curiosity. She was finally burnt on the Capucinerplatz of Warasdin (p. 40).

Various superstitious observances to prevent witches from milking the cows (p. 41).

On St. John's night the witches battle with the Kerstnicki. A Kerstnick is the twelfth son of a father, and these incur serious danger on that night from the witches, who attack them with the remains of stakes and stumps from the fields. On this account during the autumn all such things are carefully gathered and buried. Such as cannot be readily drawn out are rammed hard so as not to be removed. (The date of this is 1854.—H. C. L.) These Kerstnicki protect the world from witches (pp. 41–3).

The witches also assemble at the cross-roads on moonlit nights in order to spin there. It is not prudent to go to such places at night, for they bewitch people there and cast them into deep slumber. They assemble also on trees, especially on maples, ashes, nut and lindens of which the trunks branch out into threes, thick woods, ravines, dung-hills, ash-heaps and thickets. As soon as the sun sets they assemble in old ruins; in summer nights they gather in barns, old hollow trees, dark woods and caves. They are also thought to dwell in the grotto Kleinhäusel at Postojna in Krain and to dance on two great rocks in the neighborhood. (All this is of course an enumeration of what is said in different places.—H. C. L.) They have ape's heads and red caps. The peasant carefully avoids to pass by a dung-hill in the twilight, especially bare-

headed, being thoroughly convinced that one of the witches dwelling there will stab him. A man, still living in 1863, on leaving a tavern at midnight, was overtaken by witches and thrown three times heavily into bramble bushes; on finally rising he was dealt such a blow in the breast that three years later there was still to be seen there a cavity as large as the fist, and he declared that he would never forgive old Bara, his neighbor's wife, whom he had clearly recognized in the moonlight (pp. 43–4).

They love to dance in a gale of wind and throw themselves into the whirlwind, and rest to get rid of the sweat in places frequented by men. It fares ill with those who pass there; they lose speech or are lamed in hand or foot. If a man has pneumonia or apoplexy he is said to have trodden on witches' sweat (p. 44).

One must be careful not to walk where witches have been, for he falls into delirium lasting until hunger drives him home. Such places are known by the foot-prints of the witches, who have but four toes, the great toe being missing. This doubtless arises from the foot-prints of wild geese, swans, ducks, etc., which the peasant well knows, but he thinks that witches assume their shape (pp. 44–5).

If one stumbles upon a Sabbat he must quickly cover his head, cross himself, take three steps backwards and one forward, for then the witches cannot harm him. If one sees anything upon his garden hedge, laid there for him by a witch, he must on no account take hold of it, for within the year he will have a severe illness, and if he plays with it he will die (p. 45).

Witches dwell in waters; if one bathes in such a place he drowns and the corpse is never recovered. Such waters can be recognized by a dead cat floating on the surface. They are often very muddy and a man cannot approach within seven steps of them without being choked by the exhalation (p. 45).

Several stories which show that the details of the Sabbat are as elsewhere—save that a fairy palace arises on the meeting place, which disappears with the guests when a holy name is uttered. In one [story], the devil has the form of a calf (pp. 45–8).

Flying through the air on a goat to the Sabbat, however, is unknown to the southern Slavs. The oldest account of these assemblies among the southern Slavs appears in the poem "Osman" of I. Gundulić of Ragusa (†1638), which was published in 1621 (p. 48).

Witches ride to the Sabbat on men whom they change into horses, with a magic halter (p. 49).

Krauss's theory seems to be that these beliefs are of comparatively modern origin. There is no pure Slavic word for devil; *gjavol* is diabolus and *sotona* is Satan, both borrowed. The old pagan custom of dancing before the temple on holy days was continued on Christian feast-days and through priestly influence in time was condemned as a witch-dance presided over by the devil. In support of his general thesis of connecting modern superstitions with ancient pagan practices he adduces (p. 49) one or two customs which seem to me of little significance.

In the Sabbat eggshells are used for cups, wherefore the people always in Slavonia throw them in the fire, also nail-parings and hair-cuttings to prevent their use in sorcery. In Germany, when a man eats an egg he must break up or burn the shell; otherwise the hen will lay no more, or the witches will lay hold on him. In the Netherlands they are to be broken to prevent witches from sailing in them on the sea. In Portugal witches use them to fly through the air to India or other distant lands, where they suck the blood of unbaptized children. They must be back before midnight, when their power ends, whereby many fall into the sea and are drowned. It is the duty of everyone who eats an egg to break up the shell (p. 51).

He gives various witch-stories, which teach little except that it is observable that when the witches are discovered and burnt it is by the neighbors or husband and not by the judicial authorities. Possibly this may indicate that the stories are modern, invented since witchcraft ceased to be subject to prosecution (pp. 54–6, 60).

In every witch there dwells a devilish spirit who enables her to take the form of a fly, butterfly, hen-turkey, crow or preferably toad. When she wishes to do special injury she takes the shape of a raging beast, usually of a wolf. When the spirit leaves her, she lies insensible in lethargy. If a butterfly flies around the room in evening, it is to be caught, burnt a little and let go with the saying, "Come to me in the morning and I will give you salt." If next day a neighboring woman comes to get salt or anything else, and if she shows signs of burning on her body, it is conclusive that she is the witch of the previous evening (p. 57).

Even in Germany today Hexe is the customary name for all the small butterflies and moths and similar insects, even to the destructive little cloth-moth (p. 57).

In some places among the southern Slavs the toad is regarded as a witch in that shape and is to be killed when met with (p. 59).

When a young man dies suddenly, or a number of young children die, popular belief holds witches responsible. The Montenegrins believe that a woman who desires to become a child-eating witch must begin with her own offspring before she can attack those of others. But she cannot eat those of strangers; they must be of her own kin (p. 60).

When a witch finds a sleeping man she strikes him with her wand over the left nipple; the chest opens, she tears out the heart and devours it. The wound closes of itself. The man usually dies on the spot, but some drag on existence for a time determined by the witch, who also prescribes the manner of death (p. 60). Should the victim obtain repossession of his heart he has only to eat it and it returns to its place (p. 61). Story illustrating this (p. 62). This eating of hearts and their restoration is German as well as Slavic (p. 61). No one was safe from his nearest relatives. Mothers ate the hearts of their children (p. 63). Witches were burnt in Carniola far into the eighteenth century and such cases extended thence far into the south Slavic provinces. Only the Bulgars appear to have escaped (p. 64).

If an infant cries at night it is thought that witches are eating it; a certain weed is strewed in the cradle, or a decoction made for it to drink; or the cradle and the soles of the feet of the child are rubbed with garlic as a protection. Garlic is regarded as a preservative against witches and heads of it are worn as amulets by the peasants (p. 66).

It was formerly the custom, still preserved in Montenegro and the Herzogthum (Herzegovina), when it can be concealed from the authorities, thus to punish witches for their child-murders. All the fighting-men of a village would assemble and the eldest would address them, "Brothers, you see that our race is being rooted out by witches and sorceresses. Let God judge them. Early tomorrow let each of you bring his wife and his mother, as I also will do, to the river (or lake) and throw them in the water and thus find who are witches. We will then stone them to death or at least make them strictly swear in future to work no more evil. Brothers, will you do this?" The unanimous answer was, "Yes, we will; why not?" The next day each man would bring his woman, fasten a rope around her under her arms and cast her into the water in

her clothes. Those who sank were promptly dragged out as innocent; those who floated were adjudged guilty (but we are not told what is done with them—H. C. L.). In 1857 the Turks forced the Christian inhabitants of Trebinje (Herzegovina) to throw their women into the river Trebisnjica. Seven women, too thickly clad, who fell perpendicularly into the water, were upborne and floated. The Turks were for stoning them on the spot and the Christians with the utmost difficulty persuaded them to be content with the women solemnly swearing in church not in future to eat children. Other cases given, among them that of a widow in Rajcevic, accused of witchcraft. Strife arose as to exposing her to the ordeal, in which four men were killed (pp. 67–8).

See *Superstition and Force*, 4. ed., p. 333.

Laying a broom across the threshold prevents witches from entering a house; two brooms laid crosswise in a road obstruct their passage. (Little things such as this manifest the belief in the perpetual presence and danger of witches.—H. C. L.) Again on Saturday evening before Easter cut a little hair from between the horns of a cow; carry it to church on Palm Sunday, and as the priest utters the last blessing form some of it cross-wise between the fingers and as soon as returned home bury this beneath the threshold of the stable door. No witch can cross it; if she makes the attempt she becomes rooted to the ground and can be caught. Moreover, thereafter witches will carefully avoid the place (p. 70).

A dead witch is not to be buried in consecrated ground nor in a garden on a street or by the way-side, for other witches will disinter and reanimate her. She must be buried in a wood under an old wide-spreading tree—not a young one (p. 70).

To drive away witches, peasant women on the Sunday before Lent hang the kettle chains awry. Others put a cow's horn in the embers, for they cannot endure the stench. Cursing a witch deprives her of power. Putting undergarments on inside out protects from witchcraft (p. 71).

When a witch is so entrapped that she cannot escape, she changes herself immediately into a stone or piece of wood, according as the place is stony or wooded. If a man can recognize her and knows where her head is and hits it, he can kill her and she lies there in the assumed shape. If he fails to strike the head he inflicts no injury (p. 72).

Sloes are a protection against witches. Peasants carry them sewed in their garments (p. 72).

The unguent for flying in the air is made of mare's butter. He relates that a peasant of Toplice (near Warasdin) told him that at Christmas time a woman for three days was seeking mare's butter. She found where the horses were pastured and secured it. He met her; she was concealing it under her apron, but a corner showed out. He asked her what she was doing with it, when she suddenly disappeared, leaving him frightened. If he had not asked her she would have reduced him to dust and ashes (p. 74).

A witch ordered her son to get some grease from the chest and grease a wagon. He made a mistake and took some that she used. He greased a wheel and it began to turn around; so with the second and third, but when he greased the fourth the wagon sprang off and flew up to the top of a walnut tree and no one could bring it down until the witch by her conjurations made it descend (p. 74).

The birch has special power over sorcery. If a witch is caught in the act, and struck with a birch-broom, she loses all power. This belief in the power of the birch is not confined to the Slavs, but prevails throughout Germany, France and the Celtic and Latin lands. The mistletoe has the same virtue (p. 75).

Numerous methods of protecting cows and their milk from witches (pp. 74–6).

Stories illustrating this and powers of transformation (pp. 77–80).

The Vila was not only a wood nymph but an air spirit who controlled the clouds and tempests and merged into the witch who brought storms and hail. When a hail-storm is approaching, if a man shoots at the cloud with blessed powder in a blessed gun loaded with nails, the witch is killed and falls to earth unseen. Another cure is to throw on the hearth-fire consecrated oil, laurel leaves and wormwood. Or these things may be put in a pot filled with live coals and carried around the house so that the smoke rises in clouds, when the stench overcomes the witch and she falls down (pp. 81–2).

It is observable that the witch is assumed to ride on the clouds and tempest and a curious feature is that an imprecatory formula used when shooting at the cloud addresses her as Herodias (p. 82).

When a witch wishes to revenge herself on a man she comes to his house at night and stirs around with a spoon some water which she brings with her, until it begins to thunder and hail and devastates everything for nine parishes around (p. 83).

In comparing the South Slavic beliefs with the German and Italian, from which they have borrowed much, it is remarkable that in the Sagas there is no mention of wizards. Another difference is seen in the subordinate position assigned to the devil, who plays so great a part in the witch-trials of the others, where the witch devotes herself to him body and soul with definite formulas. Of this there is nothing in the South Slavic belief. Nor is any special power of divination ascribed to witches, for men and women on certain feast days predict freely from grains of corn, the flight of birds, the shoulder-blades of animals killed on the occasion (p. 84).

(Perhaps the absence of the devil and of compacts with him may be ascribed to the absence of the witch-trials, which did so much elsewhere to build up a consistent theory of witchcraft through confessions extracted by torture—H. C. L.); for Krauss goes on to remark the inferior position assigned to women among the South Slavs owing to the communal organization and the purchase of wives, owing to which he says the witch-trials of the West found little favorable ground in the Balkans. In Styria, Istria and Croatia, where Germanism took stronger roots, there were many witch trials and there were witches burnt. But in the law books of the Servian kings there are almost no provisions regarding witches. Western medieval demonology found here no real entrance and the Turkish rule was not favorable to it. It was otherwise in the coast lands, impenetrated by Italian culture. In the laws of the free community of Poljica (end of fourteenth century) there is a provision, "If a witch or sorceress or devil's wife is discovered she is to be immediately tortured, and if proof is obtained she is to be burnt" (p. 85).

The means by which the people seek to overcome the power of the evil women are for the most part survivals of paganism (p. 85).

The ancient beliefs, in spite of the efforts of the Church, are still living in the rural districts. "Sylphes, gnomes, feux-follets, farfadets, nains, crions, poulpiquets, fées, loups-garous,

etc., sont autant de souvenirs vivants du passé celtique et même préceltique . . . Les pierres, les sources, les animaux ont leurs légendes, parfois pénétrées d'éléments chrétiens, mais dont le fond païen reste reconnaissable. . . . Le polydémonisme de la vieille Gaule est toujours vivace, parcequ'il a poussé des racines profondes dans notre sol."—S. Reinach, Orpheus (Paris, 1909), p. 183.

In Borneo men can transform themselves into tigers and become *tigres-garous*.—Ib., p. 229.

I have in *Inquisition of Spain*, IV, p. 205, n. 4, quoted A. de los Rios that the old belief in sorcery is as strong as ever in Spain.

The Obeah of the West Indies is apparently the same as the Voudou of the Southern States. As described by West Indian writers, it is a mixture of witchcraft and poisoning very similar to the sorcery of the Middle Ages. Arsenic, powdered glass and vegetable poisons abundantly supplied by the flora of the tropics are freely resorted to when the charms of bones, dried flesh, skins, white cocks' heads, etc., etc., fail to work their effect on the intended victim. Love philtres also are abundantly furnished by them and they pretend to be able to fascinate by the eye. See Trollope's *West Indies*, Kingsley's *Christmas in the West Indies*, Day's *Five Years in the West Indies*, etc. The best account I have thus far met is in *Letters from Jamaica*, Edinburgh, 1873.

The whole process is derived from Africa, whence the negroes came.

In St. Lucia the Obeah is called "Kembois" according to Davy, *West Indies before and since Slave Emancipation*, London, 1854, p. 280. The same author states that it is obsolete in Barbadoes—and he ought to know.

The *Vossische Zeitung* of April 28, 1888, had an account of a woman burnt as a witch in the market-place of Bambamarca (Peru), after repeating scourgings.—Snell, Hexenprozesse und Geisterstörung, p. 60.

There is a revival in Protestant circles in Germany of belief in sorcery and pact with the devil. This is vigorously taught by more than one pastor; the death penalties threatened in Holy Writ are invoked for such crimes and, as the authorities will not re-enact the old laws, the clergy are called upon to strive earnestly to counteract the evil. The applause which these writings have met shows how numerous are those who are ready to revive the old superstitions.—Längin, pp. 350–2.

PISL-14
28M-8-41

COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

STATE LIBRARY
HARRISBURG

133.4

L 463
v.3 c.2

In case of failure to return the books the borrower agrees to pay the original price of the same, or to replace them with other copies. The last borrower is held responsible for any mutilation.

Return this book on or before the last date stamped below.

316562

1249	FEB 7 1973	
Jan31'52		
	MAR 21 1973	
APR 27 1966	OCT 17 1973	
JUN 1 1966	NOV 28 1973	
FEB 8 1967	FEB 13 1974	
MAR 1 1967	APR 1974	
	JUN 9 1974	
FEB 28 1968		